

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. DU PONT, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama conferees on the part of the Senate.

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS (H. DOC. NO. 890).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the information of Congress a report of the proceedings of the Eighth International Prison Congress, held at Washington in October, 1910, in pursuance of the invitation extended by the President in virtue of the joint resolution approved March 3, 1905.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State concerning the printing of the report of the proceedings of the Prison Congress.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1912.

[The report of the proceedings accompanies the message to the House of Representatives.]

IMPORTATION OF ADULTERATED SEEDS.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was recommitted the bill (H. R. 22340) to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated seeds and seeds unfit for seeding purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 985) thereon.

THE SUGAR SCHEDULE.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 21213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, July 27, 1912, at 12 o'clock m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, July 26, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the beginning and the end, the alpha and omega; our God and our Father, whose patience is without end, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, who bearest our burdens, comforteth our sorrows, chastiseth us when we do wrong, maketh the heart rejoice with gladness when we do right; Thy laws are inexorable. To keep them is heaven; to break them is hell. Continue, we beseech Thee, Thy ministrations unto us and bring us at last in harmony with Thee. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever, amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Military Academy appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 24450) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAY, Mr. SLAYDEN, and Mr. PRINCE.

TARIFF DUTIES ON WOOL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will withhold that request until to-morrow morning, perhaps I will not object to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York I will withdraw my request.

STANDARD APPLE BARRELS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 21480) to establish a standard barrel and standard grade for apples when packed in barrels, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. MADDEN, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. RODDENBERRY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. TURNBULL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

MRS. LOUISA J. ROSE—LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

Mr. LAFFERTY obtained unanimous consent to withdraw from the files of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, without leaving copies, the papers relating to H. R. 3629, granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa J. Rose.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—HOUSE DOCUMENT 613.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of House Document No. 613, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting estimates of appropriations required to meet certain claims against the United States in connection with the Engineer Department, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making appropriation to be used in exterminating the army worm.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 22195. An act to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7337. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of West Point, State of Virginia.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 7337. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of West Point, State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24699. An act extending the time for the repayment of certain war-revenue taxes erroneously collected;

H. R. 24598. An act for the relief of Jesus Silva, jr.;

H. R. 20873. An act for the relief of J. M. H. Mellon, administrator, et al., all of Allegheny County, Pa.;

H. R. 18033. An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13938. An act for the relief of Theodore Salus;

H. R. 12375. An act authorizing Daniel W. Abbot to make homestead entry;

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mary E. Quinn;

H. R. 22111. An act for the relief of the Delaware Transportation Co., owner of the American steamer *Dorothy*;

H. R. 22043. An act to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20347. An act to authorize the Dixie Power Co. to construct a dam across White River, at or near Cotter, Ark.; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making appropriation to be used in exterminating the army worm.

## ADDITIONAL CLERKS TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

House resolution 635 (H. Rept. 1066).

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint two additional clerks of said committee, who shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$6 per day from and after the time they entered upon their duties, which shall be evidenced by the certification of said chairman.

Mr. MANN. How many clerks does this authorize the employment of?

Mr. LLOYD. Two.

Mr. MANN. When did they enter upon their duties?

Mr. LLOYD. They have not begun yet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this intended simply to provide for their employment during the remainder of the present session?

Mr. LLOYD. Just the remainder of the present session.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it says so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. After the word "committee" the words "for the remainder of this session" should be inserted.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by inserting after the words "duties," in line 6, the words "until the end of the present session."

Mr. MANN. That is not where it belongs.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It should be after the word "committee."

Mr. LLOYD. In line 3, after the word "committee," insert the words "for the remainder of the present session."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, in line 3, after the word "committee," the words "for the remainder of the present session."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 25970) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912, and for prior years, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if we can fix the time for general debate?

Mr. CANNON. I have had requests for one hour and a half from two Members, one for an hour and the other for 30 minutes. So far as I myself am concerned, I do not think I shall desire more than 5 or 10 minutes in general debate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think we can easily conclude the general debate inside of three hours.

Mr. CANNON. If I desire 5 or 10 minutes of the gentleman's time—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think we can accommodate the gentleman in that way. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the gentleman asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether it is the gentleman's intention to endeavor to keep the House in session and finish the bill to-day, or whether he will be satisfied if we finish it to-morrow?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think we can at least finish it by to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. There is no intention to endeavor to force us to stay here to finish it to-day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If we proceed with such speed that it is evident that it will not prolong the session beyond the usual time, I shall be glad to finish it to-day.

Mr. MANN. If it does not prolong the session beyond the usual time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman understands very well that we will be here until doomsday unless somebody forces something.

Mr. MANN. It looks to me very much as though we would be here until doomsday, anyhow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would be a beneficial thing for the country if the other House were Democratic. Just at present it is merely obstructing public business.

Mr. MANN. The other House is the only place where they are doing business now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, three hours of general debate would place us pretty well up to 4 o'clock. So far as the consideration of this bill is concerned, upon the bill itself, I see no reason why it should not be passed to-day, but, as matters go, I should say probably it would be fortunate if we get through by 3 o'clock to-morrow. There is no disposition on my part to consume any time except upon the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois understands that the peculiar conditions existing heretofore which required the presence of many Members elsewhere on account of important business after 3 o'clock in the afternoon no longer exist, and there will be less difficulty in keeping Members in the House. They will have no longer to go to other places where their presence has seemed to be imperative.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is satisfied that we can depend upon the bulletins for the news that we desire to get? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 25970, the general deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMMOND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I shall take a very brief time to state generally what this bill contains. The estimates submitted to the committee in connection with appropriations to supply deficiencies for the past fiscal year and for other years aggregated \$11,723,874.56. The bill as reported recommends appropriations aggregating \$6,182,838.24, or a reduction under the estimates of \$5,541,036.32. Of these reductions, \$3,300,000 was an estimate to pay a judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of certain Ute Indians. After the investigation made by the committee there was very grave doubt as to the advisability of making the appropriation in the manner recommended by the department. It appeared that the item had been placed on the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House dismissed further consideration of the appropriation.

This is the smallest general deficiency appropriation bill that has been reported to the House or enacted into law since 1886. Outside of certain items in the nature of audited settlements for the Post Office Department, deficiencies for the House of Representatives, largely consisting of gratuities to the widows of deceased Members, certified judgments of courts and of the Court of Claims, and \$170,000 appropriated for a specific purpose for the next fiscal year, because of the emergency character of the item, and \$150,000 appropriated for the proper commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, in all aggregating the sum of \$1,652,241, there remains carried by the bill \$4,530,597 as the amount reported to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the various services during the past and prior fiscal years. Of these \$4,530,000, \$2,300,000 is to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the support of the Military Establishment.

These deficiencies are occasioned by the fact that in submitting the estimates required for the subsistence of the Army and for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1912 the Secretary of War arbitrarily reduced the estimates submitted by the Commissary General and the Paymaster General by \$2,534,000, and there was transmitted to Congress for the support of the Army and for the pay of the Army estimates which it was known in the War Department would be inadequate. If those estimates were to be eliminated from the amount carried in the bill, the amount carried to supply deficiencies, not accounted for in the manner already indicated, would aggregate \$2,196,597.

In some instances, Mr. Chairman, the committee in its investigations ascertained that some of the departments or some of the bureaus had deliberately ignored the antideficiency act, and in those instances the committee declined to make the appropriations to supply deficiencies. The law clearly points out the



penalty for such violations, and until those penalties are enforced by the administration the committee will not supply moneys for which obligations have been incurred in violation of law.

It is a very commendable situation that with appropriations for the maintenance of the Federal service, aggregating more than \$1,000,000,000 in a year, that outside of the matters set forth as indicated, the actual deficiencies, about which there might be some differences of opinion, amount to only \$2,196,000. That is not due to any peculiar change in the administration. It is not due to any different disposition upon the part of those in the departments to expend money according to their will rather than in accordance with the judgment of the Congress. In my opinion, based on investigations which I have made, it is due entirely to the fact that this is a Democratic House of Representatives, and the knowledge has sunk into the heads of those charged with responsibility for expending the public moneys that there is now a place and a body and a power which proposes to insist that the laws be obeyed, and that the servants of the people obey the law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, as is well known, the work of preparing bills carrying appropriations to maintain the various services of the Government is not a very easy nor a pleasant task. There had been for many years a disposition on the part of the departments to ignore not only the law, but to ignore the determination of Congress in fixing limitations upon the amounts that might be expended for various purposes. I believe that this bill indicates that there is a change in the attitude of the officials in the departments toward these matters. Realizing that the Congress will not tolerate longer the ignoring or the open violation of the law, a marked change has taken place in their attitude, and if it were possible in some way to prevent what was done regarding the Army estimates, to arbitrarily reduce them and furnish the Congress over the protest of the Commissary General and the Paymaster General of the Army estimates for the maintenance of the Military Establishment, known to be inadequate, and upon which appropriations were to be based, a much greater reform would be effected in our financial system. When the Army appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1912 was before the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] called attention to the fact that the appropriations were grossly and knowingly inadequate and would result in large deficiencies being requested by the departments. He endeavored to have appropriated sums that it was apparent the strength of the Army and the cost of rations would require.

But the Republican Congress refused to make the appropriations and turned over to a Democratic House the necessity of supplying at this time the funds necessary to pay the bills for the feeding and for the pay of the Army. There are some other matters in the bill that, during the course of its consideration, I shall be pleased to go into at greater length. The committee included in this bill, however, the item of \$150,000 as a contribution toward certain expenses in connection with the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. A number of the States in the Union, both in the North and in the South, have appropriated money to pay the transportation of Union and Confederate soldiers to the battle field of Gettysburg. The State of New York appropriated \$275,000 for this purpose. For the purpose of supplying adequate accommodations, water, and other things for the large numbers that will gather on the battle field of Gettysburg, the Congress was requested to appropriate \$150,000. It is not in order upon this bill. In view of the unanimity of the sentiment throughout the country that this celebration take place as an evidence of the union that has really taken place between all sections of the country, the committee believed it desirable and proper to include it in this bill.

Mr. HOBSON. May I ask the gentleman if the whole amount of \$150,000 is in the bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The entire amount. The committee inserted in the bill the Senate joint resolution, which was prepared along the lines desired by the officials in control of the celebration. Mr. Chairman, I shall reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to ask if it is the custom on a general deficiency bill to provide an appropriation to pay for the judgments entered in the Court of Claims, or whether they have been placed on the sundry civil bill or some other bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the general deficiency bill certain classes of certified judgments are included.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if his attention has been called to the fact that there is a judgment existing against the United States in favor of the Ute Indians and that an amendment has been added to the Indian appropriation bill at the other end of the Capitol to pay that judgment? I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a matter that the Appropriations Committee should have taken jurisdiction of instead of having it incorporated in the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It probably would have applied to this bill, but it is on the Indian appropriation bill already and the Committee on Appropriations did not desire to have it appear that it was overanxious to have the judgment paid in the way it was presented to the committee. The department not only asked for what it was entitled to under the law and under the judgment, which would have been an appropriation equivalent to 4 per cent upon the amount fixed in the judgment, the judgment being three million three hundred and odd thousand dollars, but it also desired authority to expend such part of the principal of the judgment as the Secretary of the Interior may deem advisable for the benefit of the Indians. There were some features about it that so long as it was pending in another place the Committee on Appropriations was perfectly willing to be relieved of the burden of determining what should be done. The Court of Claims decreed that certain attorneys should be paid \$210,000 or \$211,000 for services consisting, according to the report, almost entirely of work before the committee of Congress in obtaining the resolution upon which the judgment was obtained. Having some knowledge of the Committee on Indian Affairs from six years' service upon it I know of no service that could be rendered by any attorney before that committee that would be worth \$100,000 or \$200,000 or any other such indefensible sum.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that the amount allowed by the court to the attorneys, which amount I believe was \$211,000, has already been paid?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not believe it has been paid because there is no appropriation.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman, in the jurisdictional act the attorneys were shrewd enough to include a provision in the matter of the payment of their fee, so that it would be paid regardless of whether the judgment was paid or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think not.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I read the jurisdictional act which provided for the payment of these fees either out of the proceeds of the judgment or out of the proceeds of the sale of land; but under a statute passed a few years back by Congress, that no act of Congress should be construed as making an appropriation unless in specific terms the appropriation was made in the act, I know of no feature of the jurisdictional act under which anybody was authorized to pay these attorneys \$211,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say, for the information of the gentleman and for the information of the committee, that there has been paid \$211,000 to attorneys who represented the Indians in presenting the Ute Indian claim to Congress and carrying it through the Court of Claims.

Mr. FITZGERALD. From what fund was it paid?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I am not informed as to that, but I do know it was paid, because I had occasion to look it up. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Evidently the attorneys were more alert than the department. The supplemental judgment was entered some time early in 1911. If the attorneys got their money, they did very much better than the starving Indians who owned it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman if this item ought to be incorporated in the Indian appropriation bill, which is a bill providing for current expenses of the Indian Department, or whether it ought not to be incorporated in this pending bill or some other bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If it is to be incorporated in any, I think it should be in this bill.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The first question I asked the gentleman was this: If it has not been the policy of the Committee on Appropriations in either the deficiency or some other bill to make provisions for judgments that have been entered in the Court of Claims?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it has always done so and would have been done so in this instance in accordance with the law.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question in that connection? Does the Committee on Appropriations feel obligated

to pay a large judgment without any examination of the matter at all?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; and it would not have incorporated in this bill the provision submitted by the Department of the Interior in connection with the estimates for the payment of the judgment. The Court of Claims finds distinctly that the amount of the judgment is the sum upon which the interest is to be computed which is to be paid annually to the Indians. And if a paper account is to be opened up in the Treasury so as to make possible the computation of interest available for the Indians and under the proposal of the Department of the Interior we spend the principal, three million and odd dollars, for the benefit of the Indians, I am convinced that inside of 20 or 30 years somebody else will have the irrigated land and the property of the Indians, and we will have the Indians as the dependents of the Nation, with their moneys dissipated, they existing through the generosity of the people.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit me a brief statement? Owing to the fact that the Ute Indian lands and reservation were in Colorado—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I just wish to make this one statement for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if I may have his attention. In examining the findings of fact of the Court of Claims it appears that certain payments by the United States, aggregating more than \$3,000,000, had been made for the benefit of the Ute Indians under certain treaties. It is very difficult to tell the attitude of the court toward those payments. It did not give the United States credit for them. I am not so certain that the United States was not entitled to the credit of the \$3,000,000, and, if it had been, there would not have been the sum of \$3,500,000 found due to the Indians in this proceeding. There was no appeal taken.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If I am not mistaken, the Ute Indians had a fund from which they received annually an annuity; the amount I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The fund was a little over a million dollars. I think it was \$1,200,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And that fund has been merged in the judgment, and the income that has been annually going to these Indians has ceased. Is not that the case?

Mr. FITZGERALD. So I am informed.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. At the present time the judgment is not paid, and the interest has ceased upon this fund which has been merged into the judgment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the Committee on Indian Affairs could have appropriated money to be reimbursed hereafter from the Indian funds. The history of how this fund was created is very interesting. These Indians owned certain lands in Colorado; they were set aside as national forests.

The Indians have a judgment for the value of these lands so set aside as national forests at \$1.25 an acre, amounting to over 2,000,000 acres. They still have undisposed of and to their credit over 7,000,000 acres of land to be disposed of. I have examined somewhat hastily the judgment of the court, and I am not certain at all that the United States should not have been credited with more than \$3,000,000 additional paid to the Indians under the treaty.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. And if it is necessary to make some provision for these Indians, it will be easy to make an appropriation reimbursable hereafter-out of funds to be placed to their credit. But I do not agree with the Secretary of the Interior that this judgment money which should be placed to the credit of the Indians and upon which the interest charge should be calculated shall be treated as a cash item and he be given authority not only to spend the interest but to spend next year \$500,000, as he asks.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say, in justification of the fact that there was no provision made in the Indian appropriation bill for the Ute Indians, that it was not brought to the attention of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and that committee knew nothing about it and only knows of it now because an amendment was adopted by the Senate to the Indian appropriation bill providing for the payment of the judgments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman knows the fault of that condition is not with the Congress, but it is with the depart-

ment, that had all this information and never submitted it to the House.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I presume an estimate was submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the usual way as a judgment of the Court of Claims and that the estimate went to the Committee on Appropriations. It certainly did not go to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have now before me the estimates submitted, in which there is a demand that there shall be appropriated \$3,305,257.19 as the net amount of this judgment, for expenditure for the benefit of these Indians in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

It was contended at first that he would have that power under some general statute, but upon request being made to the officials before the committee for a reference to the statute it was quickly determined there was no authority whatever to spend any part of that principal, but covered up ingeniously was this provision giving the authority not now possessed by the department to expend the principal.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Unless there was some legislation in connection with it the Indian Committee would have no jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is \$3,322,305.34 found by the Court of Claims to have been paid these Indians under certain conditions, let me add, for which the United States have no credit. If it had been credited on that judgment of \$3,500,000, the only thing that would have been left would have been the sum paid to the attorneys as their fee. An examination of the supplemental judgment did not satisfy me or the other members of the committee that it was a matter upon which they were sufficiently well advised to recommend the legislation in question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I hope the body at the other end of the Capitol will add an item to pay this judgment as an amendment to this bill and let the committee that has jurisdiction of the subject dispose of it, and that it may be eliminated from the Indian appropriation bill, where it does not properly belong.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say this to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE]. I do not know what the committee at the other end of the Capitol will do on the Indian bill, but I know it will not add anything on the appropriation bill from the Committee on Appropriations that does not belong there, meritorious or otherwise; or rather, I mean it will not stay there if it be added.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I understand the gentleman to say that this item properly belongs on the general deficiency appropriation bill if it is going to be appropriated for at all?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it does.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like two minutes' time in which to make a brief statement, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I wanted to make a statement in the nature of an interruption of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. I wish to say to the gentleman that I have no personal interest, and very little of any other kind, in this appropriation; but owing to the fact that the Ute Indian Reservations and lands were located in the State of Colorado and in the district which I have the honor to represent I introduced the bill carrying the appropriation to pay the Court of Claims judgment in favor of the Confederate Band of Ute Indians.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is mistaken in saying that these lands were taken for forest reserves. The Ute Indians were forcibly dispossessed—of course, under treaty agreement—but they were forcibly dispossessed some 25 years ago, and were removed to the State of Utah. Now, these lands have been largely sold by the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A very large portion of them were put in forest reserves, and the Court of Claims in its decision says that the extraordinary services rendered by the attorneys were rendered in convincing Congress that the lands appropriated for forest reserves should be considered as sold.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I will say this to the gentleman: That some of those lands have been in forest reserves, and a great part of them have been sold to settlers, and the selling price received by the Government. I have a bill pending to make a full further allowance in favor of the Ute Indians for the lands that have been disposed of since the rendition of this judgment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the opinion of the court it is stated that



in view of the law and the facts, as stated, the court has found the lands thus set apart in forest reserves paid for at the rate of \$1.25 per acre, amounted to \$3,825,325.75; and as a set-off to these and other matters, it brings the judgment down to \$3,500,000. From that opinion of the court the gentleman can readily see that this judgment is almost entirely for land set apart for forest reserves.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Now, the attorney's fees have been paid. That is no part of the amounts carried in the bill, which is \$3,305,257.19. This is the net amount of the judgment, and, as expressly stated in the bill, it is exclusive of the amount awarded for attorney's fees, which I understand to be, as stated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE], already paid.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman please state to what committee the gentleman's bill has been referred for the payment of these claims?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes. My bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and I have mentioned it several times to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

This is what I object to, I will say to the gentleman from Texas: This appropriation has been hung onto the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate. In my individual judgment it was hung onto the bill there for the purpose of anticipating action by the Committee on Appropriations in the House on the general deficiency bill. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] assures me that he does not propose to stand for that amendment at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe that the House should not insist upon this going to the proper committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I will say that the House did so insist on this when it sent it to the committee having jurisdiction of the general deficiency bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was done, instead of its going on the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate, when the Indian Committee of the House has had no chance to investigate the grounds of the matter and determine what should be done with the fund, if we should determine it is due at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. What will result is not fair to a Member of the House. This is what will result: This general deficiency bill will go to the Senate and it will go into conference, just the same as the Indian appropriation bill. The Indian Affairs Committee of the House will not stand for this item on the Indian appropriation bill, and at the other end the item will be shifted to this bill, the general deficiency bill, so that it will be safe to predict right now that when the general deficiency bill becomes a law this item will be in it and not in the Indian appropriation bill.

This is a just debt and it ought to be paid. I am not relying simply on the statements of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, but I am relying also on statements of people in Durango to the effect that these Indians are in need and unable to pay their debts. Their funds are exhausted. There are no funds now available for the Ute Indians, so even if the whole of this judgment is not appropriated for at least a substantial part of it ought to be appropriated for. This is a condition which ought to be met.

It is conceded that this general deficiency bill is the proper bill on which to provide for judgments of the Court of Claims. It could not very well be denied when the bill actually carries appropriations to pay judgments of the Court of Claims, and I think the bill will in the end carry this judgment before it becomes a law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Can the gentleman state how it was that the attorneys' fees were paid before this judgment was collected?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that I can not explain that. I do not know a thing on earth about the relations of the attorneys to this claim. I do not know who they were; I do not know what they got, and I do not care. I simply introduced this bill by request, as a matter of duty, to get this judgment paid, because the Indians who owned the lands lived in the district I have the honor to represent. The judgment was obtained before I had any knowledge that the case was pending.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman said he wanted two or three minutes in which to make a statement. I do not want him to use up all my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have now made the statement I desired to make. My position is this: This appropriation will

finally be paid, and through this maneuvering it will finally be paid as the result of the efforts of gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol where our appropriations are usually secured.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say this to the gentleman: That this appropriation, if I can prevent it, will not be made in such a way as to permit this money being dissipated instead of being conserved for the benefit of the Indians.

The Indians have been looted now to the extent of \$200,000 for alleged services of attorneys. I do not propose, if I can prevent it, that the balance shall be appropriated with the understanding that it shall be invested in improvements on their lands and then taken by another sort of alleged friends of the Indians and the Indians themselves left in the same beggarly condition as they would be in if they had never had anything at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I shall do what I can to get the appropriation through regardless of the bill on which it is placed, who gets the credit for it, or who will be entitled to the benefit of it after it is passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe the Indians should get what they are justly entitled to, but I do not believe in enriching a lot of grafters who have been living on these dependent Indians for years under the pretense of giving them that to which they are entitled.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. This appropriation was indorsed to the gentleman's committee by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and the gentleman could have brought them before his committee and ascertained these facts, if they are facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have ascertained that they wished to do something which, in my opinion, was absolutely indefensible.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The gentleman is going behind the judgment of the Court of Claims.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is not going behind the judgment of the Court of Claims. The Court of Claims did not find that the department should have the right to expend any part of the principal of this money. It distinctly states that it is the measure of the interest to which the Indians are entitled; but the officials in the department, assuming that they know better than Congress and that they are above the law, calmly propose to spend \$500,000 at once of this \$3,300,000, because they say these Indians are in such a deplorable condition, and they make the admission that they are among the most backward Indians in the United States. To give these allotments of land and spend \$3,000,000 in improvements means that they are preparing to hand over to some very astute white gentlemen in the Western States some very desirable lands at very unremunerative prices, and to leave the Indians upon the hands of the Government and the Federal Treasury for many years to come.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, just a further very brief statement. It is true that the bill as drafted authorizes the Secretary to make payments and expenditures in his discretion, and I do not know what amount he may have asked the committee for authority to expend—

Mr. FITZGERALD. He wants authority to expend it all, but he said he would expend about \$500,000 this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. But, as I understand it, it is up to the committee to fix the limitations and say in what amounts or at what times payments may be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not. There is a change in the law. That is not controlled by the Committee on Appropriations. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield to me 10 minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] touching the amount covered by this bill, and I congratulate the House and the administration as well on the fact that this is the smallest deficiency bill that has been reported for many, many years.

This is due to several causes. I agree with the gentleman from New York in his statement that the estimates referred to by him, transmitted last year by the Secretary of War under the law, were too small. This bill would have been still less in amount if that estimate had been as large as it ought to have been.

The smallness of the bill is due to another fact. For many years Congress has been attempting to compel the Executive to cut the garment according to the cloth. Legislation has been enacted from time to time, and in both the Sixtieth and Sixty-

first Congresses legislation was enacted, which is largely to be credited with the small deficiencies carried by this bill. Notwithstanding there is a penalty against the official who expends more than is appropriated, yet from the necessities of the public service here and there expenditures have been made which are technically made in violation of the law. Just to illustrate as one instance: The Mississippi River overflowed; people were starving; the waters were rising; there was no money to relieve them. Estimates were sent for a considerable amount to relieve the flood sufferers. The appropriation was not made, and, in my judgment, wisely not made, because the President agreed to meet the existing conditions by furnishing Army rations and other service. The gentleman from New York stated that in his opinion it was the duty of the President to meet the emergency and furnish these supplies, and I concurred in that statement, and the gentleman from New York assured the President that, in his judgment, Congress would make the deficiency appropriation.

That condition was repeated again at the time of the earthquake disturbances in Alaska. A technical violation of law? Yes. But, after all, conditions must be met with intelligence and patriotism.

I am not criticizing the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. It is all very proper for us to flap our wings and rejoice when there is a desirable condition, as there is in this deficiency bill, in that it is the smallest deficiency bill of many years. It is all well enough for the gentleman to say that this is due to the Democratic majority, a statement which is received with great applause upon the other side. Well, this appropriation for the public service for the year just expired was made when the Republicans were in the majority in the House. I just state that by way of a set-off to the political part of my friend's statement. I take great pleasure in saying that substantially this bill is well made.

Another thing, the bill would have been larger if it had been passed earlier, because under the provision of law that expenditures shall not be made unless appropriated for, if this deficiency bill had been passed in March, April, or May, the public service for the remainder of the fiscal year would have been cared for in some instances where it ought to have been cared for, but was not cared for, because the law prevented it in the absence of appropriations. The fiscal year having now expired, of course that diminishes the amount of the bill.

Reference has been made to the \$3,300,000 judgment of the Court of Claims. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York that the committee did right in not including that \$3,300,000 in this deficiency bill, because it was ascertained that the Senate had put this appropriation upon the Indian appropriation bill.

The estimate was resting before the Committee on Appropriations. There were two strings to the bow, and if it was not obtained according to the will of perhaps some legislators or some people interested in the same, under conditions in one bill, they would then have another string and see if they could not do it better on another bill, and there you are. It is simply ridiculous to have two of the great money bills carrying the same appropriation and the body which amends appropriation bills putting the amendment on the Indian appropriation bill.

I have some views about this judgment in one particular which I shall not at this time discuss. I am not entirely satisfied that there ought not to be at least \$2,000,000 deducted from the amount of the judgment. I am examining and shall continue to examine that question, either as a member of the committee or as a Member of the House, or both, in order that I may act intelligently when I vote in the premises. I quite agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has stated, that whatever is done when this appropriation is made to satisfy this judgment, we should not make a law placing the whole amount of the judgment at the discretion of the Interior Department or the administration to expend it in its discretion for any purpose it may desire.

I shall not talk about the attorney fees at this time. There are 2,000 of these Indians. There are 7,000,000 acres of this land, forest and mineral and agricultural in its nature, that have not yet been sold. A large sum is yet coming to these 2,000 Indians. I trust that in the future, where suits are brought before the Court of Claims and dismissed for want of jurisdiction, there will not be legislation enacted without sufficient consideration which would give jurisdiction to the Court of Claims which will be an instruction to take jurisdiction and adjudicate the claims along certain lines. The \$211,000 of attorney fees I shall not say was a fraud upon the Indians and the Government, but I am satisfied that both Indians and Government would be far better off if these attorney fees had never been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

[Mr. GILLET addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On July 20, 1912:

H. R. 17239. An act to authorize Arkansas and Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 20501. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the site heretofore acquired for a United States immigration station at Baltimore, Md., for another suitable site and to pay, if necessary, out of the appropriation heretofore made for said immigration station, an additional sum in accomplishing such exchange, or to sell the present site, the money procured from such sale to revert to the appropriation made for said immigration station, and to purchase another site in lieu thereof.

On July 22, 1912:

H. R. 19403. An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton.

On July 25, 1912:

H. R. 21477. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

#### GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reply to some of the statements that were made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] yesterday. I hardly think it is necessary for me to state to this House, and I know it is not necessary for me to state to the gentleman from Nebraska, that anything I shall say in no way reflects upon the honesty or integrity of his purpose. He is one of the first gentleman with whom I became acquainted as a Member of this body. I formed a high regard for him then, and that regard has remained with me ever since. I shall merely attempt to criticize his judgment in some of the statements he made in his speech of yesterday and the day before.

It is not my intention to discuss the facts in relation to the selection of delegates from the State of Washington to the Republican national convention. I am not fully conversant with the facts. I was not at home at the time these delegates were named and took no part in the contest whatever. I had friends upon each side of this question. Whatever the facts are, I want them made public in fullest detail that the public may know the truth and pass judgment.

But I do resent the attempt of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to reflect upon the honesty and integrity of a large number of the citizens of my State by quoting the opinion of some man whose name he is not willing to give. The gentleman in his speech said, in substance, that a certain gentleman of wide acquaintance and of high standing, whose statements would have great weight with the Members of this House and of the country, and who was conversant with all the facts, had stated to him that the delegates from the State of Washington to the Republican national convention "were absolutely stolen." I listened to this statement with much anticipation and waited for him to give the name of the gentleman. When it seemed apparent that he did not wish to do this or had forgotten it, uncertain as to his intent, I asked him who the gentleman was. He refused to give his name, but did state later, in reply to a question from me, that the gentleman was a supporter of President Taft and a candidate for office on the Republican ticket. For this reason he had refused to permit the use of his name.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken when he says that I stated this man was a candidate for office on the Republican ticket. I made no such statement. I would



like to state that I did give the name of a man who prepared the statements.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman, as I understand it, then, stated that the gentleman to whom he referred was a supporter of President Taft and had political ambitions.

Mr. NORRIS. I judged that he did have.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman judged that he did have political ambitions.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, that is one of the men whose name I did not give.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood him to say that he was a candidate for office. If he had political ambitions I know no other inference to draw from it.

His reasons for not giving this name may be and doubtless is entirely satisfactory to himself, but his failure to either do so or to withdraw such statement I do not think was satisfactory to this House, nor do I think that the position in which the gentleman finds himself in trying to justify his use of such evidence is entirely satisfactory to himself.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I stated frankly that it was true that I admitted that would detract from my statement; but I stated that I knew the man and his opinion had great weight so far as my opinion was concerned. I did not offer that to influence the gentleman. I offered that as one of the reasons why I am convinced of the truth of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am much obliged to the gentleman for interrupting me and saying that such evidence as that has great weight in his judgment. That is the very question that I am going to discuss—the condition of the gentleman's mind when such evidence as that does have great weight with him. As these statements were directly concerning the State of Washington and a number of her citizens, I can not permit it to go unchallenged. The gentleman from Nebraska once occupied with distinguished ability a high judicial position, though I admit that no one would have ever suspected that he had been a judge from that portion of his speech to which I have referred. Think of a judge permitting a witness to testify and permitting such testimony to go into the record and be received as evidence that a certain man of high standing, well known in the community, had said that he had investigated facts and that the defendant at bar was a thief, but as he was a friend of the thief he would not permit his name to be told. It was exactly upon such evidence as this that the gentleman wanted the country to believe that the State of Washington had been stolen and a great crime against honest government had been committed.

Suppose I should rise in my place in this House and name some fellow Member and then declare that I had been told by a man of national reputation, a man whose truth and veracity the Members of this House would not doubt, that he had carefully investigated the record of the Member I had named and that he was satisfied that such Member was a scoundrel and a criminal, and then, when the name was demanded of me, I would refuse to give it because the man whom I had quoted was a friend of the Member and was a candidate for public office. What a monstrous proposition that is! Is there a man on this floor whose innate sense of honesty, fairness, and justness would not arouse his hot indignation? I would deservedly be expelled from this body and carry with me the contempt of all my former associates. Is it any less monstrous, any less dastardly to utter such statements about a large number of reputable citizens to discredit them, and for political purposes to assassinate the reputation of a great political party? I know that the gentleman from Nebraska does not approve any such method. I am still utterly unable to account for his using such methods, or having used them to fail, upon reflection, to ask to have this portion of his speech stricken from the Record. This is the method of the anonymous letter writer, held in scorn and contempt by all decent men. This is the method of the black-mailer, the most cruel and cowardly of criminals, to extort blood money from his terrified and helpless victim while shielding himself. This is the method of the pitiless poisoner of the domestic peace in his neighbor's family. This is the method of the lowest and slimiest of all God's creations, the vile monster that by anonymous whispers assassinate the reputation of virtuous women.

As I have said, I do not believe that the gentleman from Nebraska intended to be unfair. It must be that in the zeal of his cause or in the enthusiasm of hysteria he for the moment lost control of his better judgment. Had such a statement as this been made by another no man in the House would have seen it more quickly or condemned it more strongly than the gentleman

from Nebraska. Not only did the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska regarding this witness give the impression that his opinion of the case was of great weight, but it further carried with it the expression that this gentleman had unusual opportunities to know the facts, and, by implication at least, the impression was also given that he was much better informed than the general public, the national committee, or the gentleman from Wyoming in regard to the matter. I submit that the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska is a gross injustice to a large number of good men in my State, to himself, and to the great party with which he has long been identified.

But the gentleman discredits his own methods and impeaches this high-minded, far-famed, and nameless witness of his. He informs us that this great and good man, whose name we do not know, believed that the delegates from the State of Washington were stolen. If the delegates from Washington were stolen, if the unknown witness told the truth, and the contention of the gentleman from Nebraska is correct, then the convention at Chicago was fraudulent; then President Taft has stolen his nomination. Such was asserted again and again by the gentleman from Nebraska to be true. But this anonymous paragon of honor, of wide reputation, quoted to discredit honest men, is supporting Taft knowing that his nomination is stolen. This witness of high standing, of splendid character, that the gentleman from Nebraska uses without giving his name, is supporting the Republican party in its attempt to profit by this great outrage.

And, says the gentleman from Nebraska, this unknown witness of his is not only supporting Taft, the man who has received the stolen goods, but he is himself a candidate for office, or, as the gentleman now says, to quote him correctly, has political ambitions, and, therefore, does not want it known that he thinks that the delegates from the State of Washington were stolen. It is almost inconceivable that the gentleman from Nebraska should make such statement. Is it a justification for a man to support another for office when he knows that that man has stolen his nomination because he is himself a candidate? Is a man justified in refusing to expose political thefts because he is himself a candidate of the party that practiced such corrupt and dishonest methods? What becomes of the high standing, the unimpeachable character of this unknown witness which the gentleman from Nebraska has introduced? If the gentleman states the facts about his own witness he is guilty of everything that the gentleman in other portions of his speech condemns. May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska what rule he uses in measuring the honesty and the credibility of candidates for office when called as witnesses to prove political crookedness?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not yield at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. But the gentleman has asked me a question. Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman can answer it in his own time a little later, when I shall yield. He vouches in highest terms for the character, the standing, and the integrity of his nameless witness and then in almost the same sentence admits that this same witness is now supporting a candidate for President that he knows was dishonestly nominated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not at this time. I will yield a little later. Does the gentleman believe under his own statements that his own witness is entitled to credit? If he does, then what estimate are we to place upon the judgment of the gentleman from Nebraska upon any question of this character? The excuse of the gentleman from Nebraska for the nameless one is that he has political ambitions. If that is a sufficient excuse for supporting Taft, knowing that he was not honestly nominated, if that is a sufficient excuse for refusing to give to the country the truth about the Chicago convention, in the estimation of the gentlemen who are opposed to President Taft and to the action of the Chicago convention would it not also be a sufficient excuse for these same gentlemen to support other candidates regardless of the way that they were nominated? Would it not be sufficient excuse for these same gentlemen to keep from the public the truth about their own candidates and about their own party?

The gentleman from Nebraska is himself a candidate for high office, and if he is to subscribe to the doctrine that he has advanced in behalf of his unknown witness, that when he is a candidate for office he is excusable for acting with a party that he knows is corrupt, that he is excusable for supporting a candidate dishonestly nominated for the highest office in the civilized world, that he is excusable for not giving facts in regard

to dishonesty and graft in his own party, does not the gentleman impeach himself and place himself in a position where his own motives may be justly questioned?

Are we to conclude that it is upon this theory that we hear so much to-day about stolen delegations, about dishonesty, about corruption, about political robbery, that each candidate because he is a candidate is justified in denouncing and condemning in most unmeasured and vicious terms his opponent, and is equally justified in concealing the truth about his own party and his own candidates? This seems to be the logic of the position of the gentleman from Nebraska. I regret to say that this does seem to-day to be the approved method of a large class of professional reformers who are seeking by the volume of their vocabulary to make the public believe that with them rests the salvation of the Republic and that with them virtue will perish from the earth.

If an honest man, a man of highest character, of unquestioned truth and veracity, worthy of every confidence, can and does support President Taft, knowing he secured his nomination by stealing, knowing that the Chicago convention was controlled by bosses, jobbers, thieves, highwaymen, scoundrels, robbers, thugs, grafters, thimblerriggers, porch climbers, and pirates, freebooters, buccaneers, and bandits—I believe I call a majority of the names in common use by the gentleman from Nebraska and his followers—if any honest man can support the work of that convention—and this man is honest, for the gentleman from Nebraska has so declared—then to what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska continue to vex the atmosphere with his declamation? If that is his opinion of honesty and of honest men, then no one doubts that he may honestly believe that the Chicago convention was controlled by crooks. I emphasize this part of the gentleman's speech to show the temper of the gentleman, to show on what evidence he is ready to condemn others, to show what he regards as fair argument, to show the condition of his mind, to show how easily he can be convinced that others are dishonest, to show what character of men he considers high-minded and worthy of credit. I dwell upon it to emphasize the fact that a mental condition to-day seems to be widely prevalent, a condition that is anxious to believe anything from any source however disreputable, provided only that it tends to discredit. It is utterly useless to present facts or evidence or argument to sustain the good reputation or the high character or the honest purpose of any man to one in such state of mental aberration, when excitement or self-interest has so prejudiced his judgment and paralyzed his sense of reason.

Perhaps some will think that the statements of the gentleman from Nebraska should have gone by unchallenged, but I believe that reckless and unbridled statements are too common in this House. It is not to our credit that it is so. In justice to the gentleman from Nebraska I must say that he is usually careful and moderate in his statements, and weak, indeed, must be his case now if he finds it necessary to depart from his usual custom and introduce such evidence as he has done. It seems that there are many estimable gentlemen in the country that are in such dazed and hysterical condition that they have lost all sense of proportion. They seem utterly unable to weigh evidence. Their sense of fairness seems to have become paralyzed in their appeals to have it appear that they alone are honest and that they alone are the friends of the people. I hope that soon this period of suspicion, hysteria, and of reckless denunciation will have passed away, and we will have less of the cant and hypocrisy of self-appointed guardians of the people in their self-righteousness, so loudly and fervently thanking God that they are not as other men are.

There is just one other statement that I wish to notice in a sentence made by the gentleman from Nebraska and that is that the action of those who have supported President Taft had destroyed the Republican Party. It is strange to me, even if this is true in the light of the gentleman's career for the last few years that such action should arouse his solicitude or bring him regret, for if any man, according to his ability, and that ability is not small, has done more to destroy the Republican Party than the gentleman from Nebraska, then the Democratic Party should erect costly monuments to his memory and sing his praise in song and story down to the last syllable of record time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] one hour.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman from Washington has not used all his time, and I desire to ask him a question if he will yield.

Mr. CANNON. I want the hour and a half, and the gentleman will have opportunity later.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not asking for time, but I want to know if the gentleman from Washington will yield. He has not consumed all of his time, has he?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not consumed all his time.

Mr. CANNON. How much time?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-four and a half minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question or two.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] 60 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Before the gentleman yields that time, I do not see Mr. FITZGERALD on the floor—

Mr. CANNON. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing). Mr. FITZGERALD promised to yield to me 10 minutes immediately following the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. CANNON. I yield 60 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HEFLIN. Before the gentleman proceeds; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] promised to allow me 10 minutes immediately following Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not see him in the Hall, and I ask that I may be allowed that 10 minutes now.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 10 minutes, to be taken out of the time of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CANNON. I believe I have the floor, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois one hour. The gentleman from Alabama will get 10 minutes, perhaps when it will suit him better, after the gentleman from Illinois has spoken.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank my distinguished colleague for this courtesy, and I hope that I may be able to conclude my remarks without consuming all the time that has been so generously granted to me.

Mr. Chairman, when a great political party has nominated its candidate for the office of President of the United States it is only natural that the people should immediately manifest an intense interest both in the personality of the nominee and in the principles for which he is known to stand. His habits of life, his opinions on social and economic questions, his theories of governmental policy, become at once legitimate and interesting subjects of inquiry and investigation. While it is true that in a Republic like ours government must necessarily be conducted by and through political parties, yet it is also true that the platform of principles adopted by a political party and on the strength of which the candidate appeals for popular support is in no sense a true index of the candidate's worth or of his fitness for the office to which he aspires. In this enlightened day and age, when the standard of general intelligence is higher than it has ever been, the personality of the candidate becomes in a very large measure the true platform of his party. The people are more vitally interested in ascertaining the honest convictions of the candidate, formed in a time of sober and mature reflection, uninfluenced by ambition or hope of political preferment, than they are in any professions or promises contained in a platform which they know has been constructed solely to meet the exigencies of practical politics. In the history of American politics, with but very few exceptions, no man has ever been nominated for the high office of President of the United States by either of the great contending parties who was wholly unknown to fame or who had not previously rendered distinguished services to his country on the field of battle, in legislative forum, or in high executive or judicial place. The candidates who have been nominated by the Republican and Democratic Parties in this year of 1912 are not an exception to this rule. Both are men of high personal character, and both have records of public or semipublic service, which should enable the intelligent voter to form a correct conclusion as to their relative worth and fitness.

William Howard Taft has had a long and honorable career as a Federal judge, as governor of the Philippines, as Secretary of War, and as President of the United States. Woodrow Wilson, on the other hand, has been in public life for a very short time, having served less than two years in the office of governor of the State of New Jersey, that being the only political office that he has ever held. He has, however, had a long and honorable career as president of Princeton University, one of the great universities of this Nation, and he has had even a longer career as an author of note and distinction. He has been a most prolific writer, exploring every nook and corner of the field of history, sociology, and political economy. In his



voluminous writings and public addresses every subject in which the American people have ever shown the slightest interest, with the possible exception of the question of race suicide, has been treated by him in a manner which reflects great credit on his intellectual courage and independence, if not upon his political foresight and acumen. But I want to say in defense of the scholarly professor and man of letters that at the time he was expressing his honest views on these multitudinous subjects his fine literary soul was unvexed and unannoyed by the alluring prospects of political preferment. The shadow of the White House had not fallen athwart his peaceful path. The presidential bee had not yet begun to buzz. In fact, it had not even been hatched.

It is with this period in the professor's life that I purpose to deal to-day. For the benefit of such as do not have ready access to his numerous publications I desire to call attention to some of the startling views expressed by Prof. Wilson on men and measures, principally as they appear in his most important work, "*History of the American People*." This history was published in 1902, only 10 years ago. At the time of publication Prof. Wilson was 46 years of age, and by reason of his erudition and scholarly attainments enjoyed then, as he does now, the titles of doctor of philosophy, doctor of literature, and doctor of laws. It will be apparent, therefore, that the views expressed by him are not the hasty and ill-considered fulminations of a college graduate, but rather the sober and philosophic reflections of the matured student and thinker.

#### WOODROW WILSON VERSUS THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson is regarded as the founder of the Democratic Party and by common consent is accepted as its patron saint. His teachings have furnished Democracy's inspiration since the foundation of the party. Impassioned Democratic orators have been known to bring tears to the eyes of their listeners while describing the patriotic pulsations of that great heart that was wont to beat in sympathy with the oppressed of all mankind. In glowing terms they have pictured Thomas Jefferson as the great commoner, the embodiment of all the homely virtues, simple in all of his tastes, and devoted to the plain people of whom he was part and parcel. No Democratic national convention has ever failed to pay homage to the "Sage of Monticello." At the convention which met at Baltimore we find as the first resolution that time-honored, moss-grown, stereotyped expression with which we are all so familiar:

We, the representatives of the Democratic Party in national convention assembled, reaffirm our devotion to the principles of Democratic government as formulated by Thomas Jefferson.

To-day the mantle of the immortal Jefferson rests upon the narrow but classic shoulders of the Princeton professor. That mantle was placed there amid scenes of great excitement on the second day of July, by the frenzied followers of the lamented Jefferson in convention assembled at Baltimore. It was done in the daytime, in the full glare of the midday sun, at an hour when the spirits of the departed that hover forever near the scene of their earthly activities are supposed to go into retirement, preparing for their nightly walks. Jefferson was taken at a disadvantage, and he is therefore not to blame, for, if given an opportunity, I insist that the spirit of the author of the Declaration of Independence would certainly have protested, and protested vigorously, against the action of that convention. In righteous indignation he would have pointed to page 3, volume 4, of Woodrow Wilson's *History of the American People*, in which appears this sentiment:

The difference between Mr. Jefferson and Gen. Jackson was not a difference of moral quality so much as a difference in social stock and breeding. Mr. Jefferson, an aristocrat, and yet a philosophical radical, deliberately practiced the arts of the politician and exhibited oftentimes the sort of insincerity which subtle natures yield to without loss of essential integrity.

He would next have pointed to page 289 of Wilson's *Life of George Washington*, in which Prof. Wilson characterizes Thomas Jefferson as a "philosophical radical rather than a statesman," and says further:

Washington found him a guide who needed watching.

Mr. Chairman, if Woodrow Wilson is correct in saying that Thomas Jefferson was at heart an aristocrat while pretending to be of and for the common people, if he is correct in placing upon him the brand of insincerity, then Jefferson was easily the greatest demagogue, the most consummate hypocrite that has ever lived in the tides of time. If Wilson is correct in saying that in the critical formative period of our Nation's life Jefferson was wanting in loyalty to Washington, in whose Cabinet he served, and that he was "a guide who needed watching," then I insist that Jefferson was not a patriot, but a dissembler and an intriguer.

I for one, however, refuse to accept Woodrow Wilson's estimate of the character of Thomas Jefferson. I decline to have one of the historic idols of my youth and manhood shattered by a Democratic candidate for the Presidency. [Applause on the Republican side.] As the years recede the halo that surrounds the memory of the immortal Jefferson grows brighter and brighter, and I insist that that halo can not and must not be dissipated by Woodrow Wilson or any other Democratic theorist in the United States. The fame of Jefferson is secure; his is "one of the few, the immortal names, that were not born to die." But with Woodrow Wilson as the candidate for the Presidency I insist that it is high time for the Democratic Party, as a matter of expediency, if not consistency, for the latter is well-nigh impossible, and in justice to both Jefferson and Wilson, to change the name of its patron saint.

It is always a great embarrassment to a candidate to find himself out of harmony with a popular tradition of his party, and it is not exactly fair to the memory of the man who is responsible for the tradition.

#### WILSON VERSUS THE FOREIGN-BORN CITIZEN.

Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the spirit of "Know-nothingism" that was once rampant in this country was long since dead. I was under the impression that that spirit had been crushed out of existence forever by the convincing power of the great truth which lies at the very foundation of our republican form of government, that "all men are created free and equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." I did not believe that the time would ever come when a great political party would nominate as its candidate for President a man in whom there seems still to linger a trace of the intolerance, the prejudice, and the narrow resentment that gave birth to the un-American, antiforeign agitation of some 50 years ago.

On page 212, volume 5, Woodrow Wilson's *History of the American People*, I find this remarkable statement:

Now, there came multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence; and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population. The people of the Pacific coast had clamored these many years against the admission of immigrants out of China, and in May, 1892, got at last what they wanted—a Federal statute which practically excluded from the United States all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence; and yet the Chinese were more to be desired, as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.

Mr. Chairman, it has long been our proud boast that ours is the land of liberty and of opportunity.

Here, on the hospitable shores of the "home of the free," the persecuted of the earth have always found a refuge and an asylum. Our welcome has gone out to all alike. We recognize neither class nor caste, nationality nor religion. Every honest immigrant, no matter from what country he hails, whether from the north of Europe, the south of Europe, the east of Europe, or the west of Europe, if able to meet the requirements of our liberal immigration laws, is invited to partake of our liberties and to join with us in working out the manifest destiny of the American Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is this spirit that lies at the basis of our national greatness. It is this spirit that is responsible for our national supremacy. And to the eternal credit of the vast majority of our foreign-born citizens, including those from the south of Europe, be it said, that when they take the oath of allegiance to the laws and Constitution of our country, they become American citizens, not only in word, but in spirit as well, and they instill in the hearts of their children a sincere love and reverence for the old flag and for the institutions of their adopted country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, my friends, the history of civilization teaches us that liberty does not live with the rich, the powerful, and the great. It lives with the poor, the lowly, the humble, and the oppressed. Its fires have always burned more brightly in the humble cot of the day laborer than in the stately mansion of the multi-millionaire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

God knows, I would not deny to any man, no matter how lowly his position in life, the right to enjoy the liberty of a free country. While I believe in the strict enforcement of our immigration laws, to protect us against the vicious, the lawless, and the depraved, yet I would not draw the line against admitting immigrants who, judged by our own experience, possess the possibility of developing into useful American citizenship.

My sympathy goes out to the man who has never had a chance in the struggle for existence, to the man whose dreary

pathway through life has never been illuminated by the bright, golden sunlight of hope and opportunity. I would not discriminate against the Italian, the Hungarian, or the Pole. I have not forgotten that Columbus was the son of an Italian laborer. I have not forgotten that among the great sculptors and artists who have given Italy her proud place in the world of art are the sons of men who earned their bread in the sweat of their brows. Ah, genius knows no nationality, and is not the result of birth or location. No nation has a monopoly on intellect, a corner on brains. Italy has her Garibaldi, Poland, her Kosciuszko, Hungary, her Kossuth; and even the learned Princeton professor may profit by reading the inspiring story of their heroic lives. [Applause on the Republican side.] In this land of equal opportunity, the son of the immigrant of to-day may become the American statesman of to-morrow. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, as I read the pathetic story of the patriotic struggle of the people of the south of Europe for greater freedom and for larger opportunity, and as I recall all that they have contributed to the genius of our national life, I must take issue with Prof. Wilson. I believe that these people are superior in every way to the Chinese, and that it is an insult to the Caucasian race to say that they are not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

#### WILSON THE FRIEND OF THE CHINAMAN.

Prof. Wilson seems to be especially fond of the Chinese. Continuing the quotation which I have just read, on page 213, volume 5, of Woodrow Wilson's History of the American People, the professor proceeds as follows:

They—

Meaning the Chinese—

had, no doubt, many an unsavory habit, bred unwholesome squalor in the crowded quarters where they most abounded in the western seaports, and seemed separated by their very nature from the people among whom they had come to live—

Now listen—

but it was their skill, their intelligence, their hardy power of labor, their knack at succeeding and driving duller rivals out, rather than their alien habits, that made them feared and hated and led to their exclusion at the prayer of the men they were likely to displace, should they multiply. The unlikely fellows who came in at the eastern ports were tolerated because they usurped no place but the very lowest in the scale of labor.

Mr. Chairman, the history of the Geary Act, which passed in 1892, and which resulted in the exclusion of the Chinese from the United States, tells us that that act was passed upon the unanimous and urgent request of American workingmen, who justly regarded the Chinaman as an alien, incapable of assimilation and incapable of Americanization. I do not agree with Prof. Wilson in the statement that the workingmen of this country were driven to make demand upon Congress for this legislation because of their "fear of the superior skill and intelligence" of the Chinese. I know of no wage earner in the great industrial district which I have the honor to represent in this chamber who is not the superior of the Chinaman in point of "skill, intelligence, or power of labor." I know of no American wage earner anywhere who is only a "dull rival" of the Chinaman. There can be no rivalry between the intelligent laborers of the United States and the ignorant coolies of China. Rivalry can exist only between equals. There is no equality between an American and a Chinaman, and Prof. Wilson wholly underestimates the character and the capacity of the American workingman when he makes a statement to the contrary. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As I read Prof. Wilson's glowing tribute to the Chinese race I could readily understand why the Chinese Students' Club of America met in the city of New York on the 2d day of February, 1912, and solemnly indorsed the candidacy of their friend, "Woodrow Wilson." [Laughter on the Republican side.] I can readily understand why there was such great rejoicing in the Chinese laundries of this country when the news went out that Wilson had been nominated for President at Baltimore. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Even at the risk of alarming my colleagues on this side of the Chamber I am forced to admit that the Chinese vote is hopelessly lost to the Republican Party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It has gone over in a body to Woodrow Wilson. [Applause on the Republican side.]

#### WILSON VERSUS LABOR UNIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in union labor and in labor unions. I regard them as the logical outgrowth of our modern industrial system, and I know that they have accomplished much for the betterment of the conditions of those who toil for a living. During the 12 years that I have been honored with a seat in this Chamber I think my colleagues will bear me out when I say that I have always been a consistent and loyal

supporter of any measure that was presented for the consideration of this House which would prove beneficial to the working men of this country. I believe that any man who has ever given the slightest thought to this subject recognizes and fully appreciates the great and good work that is being done by the labor unions of to-day.

The Democratic Party in the platform adopted at Baltimore professes undying friendship for organized labor, and then, as an evidence of its sincerity, nominates as its candidate for President, Woodrow Wilson, who, on the 13th day of June, 1909, only three short years ago, in a baccalaureate address to a graduating class at Princeton, expressed the following remarkable views on this all-important subject:

You know what the usual standard of the employee is in our day. It is to give as little as he may for his wages. Labor is standardized by the trades unions, and this is the standard to which it is made to conform. No one is suffered to do more than the average workman can do; in some trades and handicrafts no one is suffered to do more than the least skillful of his fellows can do within the hours allotted to a day's labor, and no one may work out of hours at all, or volunteer anything beyond the minimum. I need not point out how economically disastrous such a regulation of labor is. It is so unprofitable to the employer that in some trades it will presently not be worth while to attempt anything at all. He had better stop altogether than operate at an inevitable and invariable loss.

The labor of America is rapidly becoming unprofitable under its present regulation by those who have determined to reduce it to a minimum. Our economic supremacy may be lost because the country grows more and more full of unprofitable servants.

I do not agree with Prof. Wilson that members of trades unions are "unprofitable servants." I do not agree with him that the man who belongs to a labor organization is trying "to give as little as possible for his wages." I do not agree with him that the work of the least skillful member of a labor organization sets the standard which marks the amount of work that his fellow craftsmen can perform. I do not believe that that great organization, the American Federation of Labor, is trying to make American labor unprofitable by reducing it to a minimum.

I do not believe that Mr. Gompers, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Morrison are trying to destroy the economic supremacy of the United States. If I read Prof. Wilson aright, he is opposed to putting any limitation on the hours of labor, and would therefore, in order to produce more "profitable servants," exact from the wage earner all that human endurance is capable of producing.

My friends, the recognition of the eight-hour day as constituting a day's work is one of the greatest triumphs of organized labor. [Applause.] It represents years of faithful, patient, intelligent effort and agitation, and it is in full harmony with the enlightened spirit of the times. Its abolition, as so manifestly desired by Prof. Wilson, in order to produce more "profitable servants," may prove popular with a Princeton graduating class, but I am sure that it will never prove popular with the 20,000 union men who live and work and vote in the twenty-second congressional district of Illinois. [Applause.]

And I go further. I measure my words well when I say that organized labor would receive a blow from which it would not recover in 20 years if a man holding the views that Woodrow Wilson holds on the question of labor organizations should be elected to the Presidency on a platform which limits his tenure of office to a single term in the White House. Platform or no platform, he would consider himself free to bend every energy and to use the power and influence of his great office to carry into effect his own narrow views on the question of organized labor.

#### WILSON VERSUS THE SOLDIER.

Mr. Chairman, on the 12th day of December, 1911, 98 Democratic Members of the present House joined with 130 Republicans and 1 Socialist and passed the Sherwood service pension bill. Eighty-four Democrats and only eight Republicans are recorded in opposition to this bill.

While the provisions of the Sherwood pension bill were not as liberal and generous as those of the Sulloway bill which we passed in the preceding Congress, yet, taken as a whole, it is a very meritorious measure, and the gallant veterans of the great civil conflict, whose ranks are so rapidly thinning, have reason to thank Gen. SHERWOOD, Mr. SULLOWAY, Col. BRADLEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. FULLER, and the other members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions for the splendid work that was done in their behalf.

In the platform adopted at Baltimore I find this plank:

We renew the declaration of our last platform relating to a generous pension policy.

Prof. Wilson, the Democratic candidate for President, does not seem to be in harmony with this declaration. In a review of the administration of Grover Cleveland, whom he eulogizes



to the point of idolatry, on page 180, volume 5, History of the American People, Prof. Wilson says:

What most attracted the attention of the country, aside from his action in the matter of appointments to office, was the extraordinary number of his vetoes. Most of them were uttered against pension bills, great and small. Both Democratic House and Republican Senate were inclined to grant any man or class of men who had served in the Federal armies during the Civil War the right to be supported out of the National Treasury, and Mr. Cleveland set himself resolutely to check their extravagance. He deemed it enough that those who had been actually disabled should receive pensions from the Government and regarded additional gifts for mere service both an unjustifiable use of the public money and a gross abuse of charity.

In view of this remarkable statement, I would like to inquire how many Republicans and Democrats in this House who voted for the Sherwood service pension bill, or any other pension bill, did so on the theory that any man who had ever served in the Federal Army had an absolute right to be supported out of the National Treasury? I would like to inquire of the Democrats who supported this bill if they agree with Prof. Wilson that legislation of this kind is an "unjustifiable use of the public money and a gross abuse of charity"? The trouble seems to be that Prof. Wilson does not comprehend the true spirit and intent of our pension system. I maintain that the man who spent several of the best years of his young manhood in the service of his country is entitled to the everlasting gratitude of the Nation, whether he was actually disabled or not [applause on the Republican side], and that gratitude can only manifest itself in a practical way by granting him a pension in his declining days to compensate him for the loss that he sustained while at the full zenith of his power and capacity to earn a competency for himself and his family. [Renewed applause.]

No, no, my friends, a service pension is not "an unjustifiable use of the public money." It is not "a gross abuse of charity." It is founded on the eternal principles of right and justice. It is the expression of a Nation's love for the heroism of the men who were prepared to sacrifice their lives on the altar of patriotism that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people might not perish from the earth." [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is possible that Prof. Wilson has experienced a change of heart since he wrote those cold and heartless lines, for I recall that less than a year ago he himself applied to Andrew Carnegie for a pension, and based that claim not upon disability but upon "mere service" as an educator. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I hope the fact that he did not succeed in getting the Carnegie pension will not embitter his soul, but that it will lead even him to recognize the injustice of his views as expressed on the question of service pensions.

WILSON VERSUS BRYAN.

Mr. Chairman, the dominating power in the Baltimore convention was William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska. In fact, William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, has been the dominating power in the Democratic Party so long that the memory of a "first voter" runneth not to the contrary. For 16 long and weary years he has been Democracy's Old Man of the Sea, gripping her with a strangle hold and choking her into abject submission to his every whim and caprice. In utter defiance of a precedent that has been as binding as law in every Democratic national convention for 60 years, in utter disregard of every consideration of elementary decency and fair play, he succeeded in robbing the distinguished Speaker of this House of the honor of a nomination for the high office of President of the United States after the Speaker had secured a majority of the votes on eight successive ballots [applause], and he succeeded in bestowing that honor upon a man who was not only not his friend but his pronounced and active enemy.

If it be true that Opportunity knocks but once at every man's door, then CHAMP CLARK may never again have a chance to be President of the United States, but CHAMP CLARK will live in the hearts and affections of his fellow men long after William Jennings Bryan shall have been forgotten. He will live, and his name will be honored because all the world knows that CHAMP CLARK has always been true to his friends, true to his ideals, true to his conception of duty, standing "four-square to all the winds that blow," in fair weather and in foul. [Applause.] And when the impartial historian of the future shall come to write of his base betrayal at Baltimore he will denounce the act of William Jennings Bryan as marking the very acme of perfidy, the culmination of political treachery. [Applause.]

I have said that Prof. Wilson was not the friend of William Jennings Bryan, and for a verification of that statement I refer to page 258, volume 5, Woodrow Wilson's History of the American People, and this is what he says about the man who

was once democracy's "peerless" but who is now her "cheerless" leader:

Mr. Bryan, though he had been a Member of Congress and had spoken in the House upon the coinage question, had made no place of leadership for himself hitherto, was unknown to the country at large and even to the great mass of his fellow partisans, and had come to the convention with the delegation from Nebraska unheralded, unremarked. A single speech made from the platform of the convention had won him the nomination, a speech wrought not of argument but of fire, and uttered in the full tones of a voice which rang clear and passionate in the authentic key of the assembly's own mood of vehemence and revolt. It was a thing for thoughtful men to note how a mere stroke of telling declamation might make an unknown, untested man the nominee of a great party for the highest office in the land, a popular assembly being the instrument of choice.

Mr. Wilson was not the friend of Mr. Bryan in 1896, and he was not his friend as late as April 29, 1907, when he wrote the following letter from Princeton:

MY DEAR MR. JOLINE: Thank you very much for sending me your address at Parsons, Kans., before the board of directors of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. I have read it with relish and entire agreement. Would that we could do something, at once dignified and effective, to knock Mr. Bryan once for all into a cocked hat.

[Laughter from the Republican side.]

"I have read it with relish and entire agreement!" And in the Parsons speech Mr. Joline, the great trust and corporation lawyer, gives utterance to this sentiment:

But I venture to utter what is perhaps a feeble protest against the blind and foolish outcry against all railways. You and I know who are responsible for this socialistic, populist, antiproperty crusade. It is the cry of the envious against the well to do—the old story. It is not new to this generation, only it is louder and more bitter than ever before in this country.

This is what Woodrow Wilson read "with relish and entire agreement." This was his honest opinion as late as 1907 of Bryan and Bryanism, and yet to-day, to gratify his ambitions, he is prepared to set aside the convictions of a lifetime, to don sackcloth and ashes and to eat out of the hand of the man whom he denounced as an untried declaimer, and who, because of his populist and socialistic tendencies, he was anxious to "knock into a cocked hat once for all." [Applause on the Republican side.] Oh, what a spectacle for gods and men! What an example for the youth of our land to emulate! How proud our Democratic friends should be of the sincerity, the consistency, and the moral courage of their candidate for President of the United States! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go much further into the record of this anti-Jefferson, antiforeign, antilabor, antisoldier, and pro-Chinese candidate for the Presidency. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I shall not speak of his remarkable reversal of opinion as to the efficacy of the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. Suffice it to say that a few years ago he denounced this doctrine as revolutionary and as destructive of constitutional government. Yet to-day he loudly proclaims it as the one panacea for all the ills that afflict the body politic. I shall not speak of his sneering references to the Farmers' Alliance and of his characterization of the Knights of Labor as being tainted with the hideous doctrine of anarchy. I believe that it was Job who said, "Oh, that mine adversary had written a book." I would say, "Oh, that the voters of this country would read the books written by mine adversary." For if Woodrow Wilson's History of the American People were made a campaign document and placed in the hands of every man who will exercise the sacred right of franchise on the 5th day of next November he would be buried beneath an avalanche of votes so deep that he would never hear the blast of Gabriel's trumpet on the morning of the resurrection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party faces this contest with courage and with confidence. We know that we are right and we have an abiding faith in the triumph of any question of truth or justice submitted to the will of a free and an enlightened people. We have an abiding confidence in the discriminating sense of the American voter. We believe that he can distinguish between wheat and chaff, between a statesman and a demagogue, between evolution and revolution. [Applause on the Republican side.] The record of the administration of William Howard Taft will be fully vindicated. When the froth and foam and fury of misrepresentation shall have disappeared, when the billows of billingsgate shall have subsided, when the calm succeeds the storm, the sober-thinking people who are in a majority in this country will do full justice to this brave, fearless, and manly man who has never failed to do the right as "God has given him to see the right." [Applause on the Republican side.] They will elect William Howard Taft as his own successor because in him the American people recognize the dignity and the majesty of an honest man who has tried faithfully to uphold the best traditions of the Republican

Party, the party of progress and protection, the party of a people's hope and of a Nation's desire, the party that believes in preserving in all its strength and purity and glory the Constitution of the fathers. "We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord." [Loud and continued applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, before this session of Congress adjourns I expect to call to the attention of the House the statements made by the President of the United States and by a former President of the United States in which they picture their real thoughts regarding each other. They had them concealed for some years, but the exigencies of the present political campaign compelled them to develop their real beliefs regarding each other. I shall set forth their views of each other as a contribution to important historical events of the recent past. At this time, however, I desire to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech by Hon. Woodrow Wilson on "Government in relation to business," which was delivered at the recent banquet of the Economic Club of New York at the Hotel Astor on May 23, 1912, in which he makes some pertinent observations as to the methods adopted and followed by the Republican Party during the past few years in enacting legislation and in legislating particularly for the benefit of "big business" rather than for the masses of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a certain speech designated by him.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the other day the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by Dr. Woodrow Wilson, to which, for some reason, a gentleman on the Democratic side objected, and I desire to couple that request with the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is it?

Mr. MANN. If you are not willing to have printed in the RECORD any speech he made, say so.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to the request. I think the more that is published of Dr. Wilson's writings the better it will be for the Republican Party, but I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that the speech to which he referred was subsequently made a part of my remarks on the day after the gentleman from Georgia had refused unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. I want to know whether anybody on the Democratic side objects to the printing of this speech of Woodrow Wilson's.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would gladly print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and send to every voter in the United States a copy of everything Woodrow Wilson has ever written. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I think if that were done I do not believe that there would be a single State in the Union which would not cast its electoral vote for the Democratic candidate after November.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman has read the speech since a gentleman on the other side objected to its being printed the other day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman must not put me in that attitude. I did not make any such objection.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was not here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I had been, I would have been glad to have induced gentlemen to withdraw their objections. It might have been that some one objected to the printing in the RECORD of extracts from speeches of Gov. Wilson—

Mr. MANN. That was not the request at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). A practice that has been followed in certain parts of the country, where they have printed portions of his speeches which entirely misrepresent his attitude and his statements on important public questions. Whenever gentlemen desire to publish in full his statements I know that this side of the House will not only welcome the publishing of them, but will gladly contribute to the circulating of them, not only among Democrats but among the disorganized, disheartened, and discredited Republicans of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, still reserving the right to object, I decline to let the gentleman from New York insinuate in any way that the request which was made the other day and objected to was to print extracts. It was to print a speech in full, and the request was refused by the Democratic side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Who objected?

Mr. MANN. A number of gentlemen made serious inquiry and afterwards had some one object.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is not a fair statement to put in the RECORD. It does not show that some Democrats induced another

Democrat to object, and the gentleman has no right to make any such statement.

Mr. MANN. Well, I make it. I do not misrepresent gentlemen who were not within a thousand miles of here, and they should not undertake to say anything on the floor about my misrepresenting that which they know nothing about.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the world is at war with tyrants and the party of Jefferson has practically destroyed the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Behold the two factions of this agent of predatory wealth, each accusing the other of hypocrisy and theft.

I used to hear it said that—

When thieves fall out and begin their fights,  
Honest men will get their rights.

I have heard from my youth time that "it takes a thief to catch a thief." I have heard it said also that the way of the ungodly shall perish, and "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The Republican Party has sown political corruption. That party is now reaping the fruits of that corruption. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Well can that party now exclaim, "The thorns that I have reaped are of the tree that I have planted. They have torn me and I bleed."

As I view the mutilated form of this old party of plunder, and as I see the spoliemen, the pie-hunting brigade, arrayed on opposing sides, the big fat man from the Philippines commanding one army and the wild man from Africa commanding the other [applause and laughter on the Democratic side], I recall these appropriate lines:

Humpty Dumpty sat on the wall,  
And Humpty Dumpty got a great fall;  
And all the king's horses and all the king's men  
Can't put Humpty Dumpty together again.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen have told us on that side that the nomination was stolen from Roosevelt at Chicago. Other gentlemen on that side contend that money was used to corrupt voters to buy them for Roosevelt. Both factions have been indicted and both factions stand convicted at the judgment bar of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Roosevelt wants to come back and serve the powers that he served so well when in office before. But the present President has gone him one better, and the Woolen Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Beef Trust, and other trusts are saying "Hurrah for Taft." But the Harvester Trust and Perkins, Morgan, and many of the tariff barons are thankful for past favors, and are saying "Hurrah for Roosevelt." One has served them; the other is serving them now. With the Republican Party it is not so much in the "happy long ago" and the "sweet by and by" as it is in the "happy now and now." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, look upon the prostrate form of the old stand-pat party.

Who killed Cock Robin?  
"I," said the Roosevelt sparrow,  
"With my little bow and arrow;  
I killed Cock Robin."

[Applause and laughter.]

Who saw him die?  
"I," said the Taft fly,  
"With my little protection eye;  
I saw him die."

[Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Who will dig his grave?  
"I," said the crow,  
"With my Democratic hoe;  
I'll dig his grave."

[Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Who will toll the bell?  
"I," said the independent bull,  
"For I can pull;  
I'll toll the bell."

[Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Who will be chief mourner?  
"I," said the trust dove,  
"For I mourn for my love;  
I'll be chief mourner."

[Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

So, my friends, let the bell toll. The Republican Party's withered soul floats on the Stygian river. Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has shown us what a thieving, villainous gang marches behind the



banner of Taft, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has shown us what a motley crew of hypocrites and trust agents follow the flag of Roosevelt, and the people of all parties are praying that Democracy's great leader will be elected, and the signs of the times point to the overwhelming election of Woodrow Wilson President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG], who has just spoken, is the most cheerful and best-natured mourner that I have ever seen following a political hearse. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The gentleman whistles to keep up his courage. He raised his hand and said, "We go into this campaign with confidence."

He reminds me of my experience with a negro that I once defended for murder. I assured him that he would be acquitted by the jury. He talked as though he thought so, too, until he got into the court room and heard the indictment read and saw the solicitor, who was a splendid prosecuting officer. He looked around at me doubtfully. I said, "Joe, we are going to acquit you." He hung his head for a moment and then said: "Mr. HEFLIN, there is some talk around here about Dr. Hudson getting my body. I don't want my body cut up." I said, "What?" He said, "Dr. Hudson wants my skeleton. I make this request of you: I do not want any doctor to put a knife into my body when I'm dead." [Applause and laughter.] I began to fear, as Joe did, that they would convict him, and they did convict him. Joe knew that he was guilty, but he talked of his innocence right up until the time he was arraigned, and somehow or other he commenced to think what would happen to his body should he be hanged, and he knew what was going to happen.

So my friend RODENBERG, if he would only speak the conviction that is in his heart, would say: "Boys, by gosh, they've got us. What will become of us after the election in November?" [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman, by his attack on the great statesman of New Jersey, can not turn the attention of the people from the miserable record of the Republican Party—

For the raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting  
On the pallid bust of Pallas, just above your chamber door,  
And the lamplight o'er him gleaming, \* \* \* casts his  
shadow on the floor;  
And your party's soul—  
From out that shadow shall be lifted—nevermore.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a few minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I always listen, Mr. Chairman, with great interest to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. Great heavens! If he had turned to theology, what a powerfully rousing individual he would have been at a camp meeting. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to undertake to make reply, or to detain the House. You know that little story of the Sunday-school teacher with the little class of boys. She said, "Listen, little boys, while I read you from the Holy Bible," and she turned and read the proclamation of Goliath, who, full-armored, pranced out before the armies of the living God and made his "defi," "hooplah," day after day repeated. One bright-eyed little boy in the class said, "Skip that, madam; he is blowin'." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Goliath HEFLIN, we will skip it. You are "blowing." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

One word in conclusion, and then I will sit down. After all, a great contest is in front of us, all the people are co-sovereigns. The campaign will soon commence. We shall have various candidates. The Republican Party has a candidate. The Democratic Party has a candidate. There are various other candidates. [Laughter.] When the silent ballots fall somebody will be chosen. Perchance, if in the chapter of happenings and by a vote of the majority your candidate Mr. Wilson is elected and becomes President of the United States, he will be your President, and my President, the President of the whole country, the coordinate branch of the Government, the titular leader of his party in all soberness; and you will be called on many a time to answer this question: If you succeed and elect your candidate for the Presidency, will his policy be shaped according to the first 42 years of his life, as evidenced by his writings, by his teachings? Or will it be shaped by what he has said in the last 12 months, directly to the contrary of his teachings? Who is to be deceived if he becomes President? And will it be by his givings out of the last 12 months, or by his words and writings and actions for the first 42 or 43 years of his life? [Applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from

the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 38. An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes.

#### GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be an afternoon of reading, some of ancient history, some of modern. I wish to take a moment or two of the House to read something from the editorial page of to-day's New York Sun, which appears to be prophetic, in view of the speech that was delivered a few moments ago by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

This editorial is headed "A waste of wind." It is as follows:

#### A WASTE OF WIND.

The Hon. WILLIAM A. RODENBERG, Republican Representative in Congress of the twenty-second Illinois district, is reported to be laden with a most tremendous and horrendous speech, wherein he will trace every known spoken and written word of Woodrow Wilson since that statesman acquired language and the use of the pen. Every bit of his "record" is to leap to light; every book and magazine article of his has been searched with a gerfalcon eye; let him tremble and cower while the majestic and surcharged RODENBERG "exposes" his inconsistencies, "scores" him, "excoriates" him, "lays" him; shakes the Rodenbergian fist and the untanned Wilsonian hide before the haggard eyes of mankind.

In the name of the prophet, stuff!

It is with the Woodrow Wilson of to-day and not of any other time that the country has to deal. Everybody wants to know what he says, what he writes in his great representative capacity as the chosen chief and spokesman of the Democracy. Nobody cares a fringed speech what he has said or written or is to be gulled by any malicious midgemadage of extracts and quotations.

Mr. RODENBERG is wasting his wind.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. All truth is wasted on that side of the House. The Members on that side are incorrigible. Any truth is wasted over there.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24565) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and had insisted upon its amendments still in disagreement, and had asked a further conference and had appointed Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. TILLMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 18041) granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii.

#### GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely unnecessary for me to reply to the kind of a speech that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has seen fit to make, as far as the issues involved are concerned. I wanted to ask him a question or two; and as the House well remembers, he refused to yield. One of the questions I desired to ask was, after he had devoted 24 minutes of his 30 minutes to personal abuse of myself, whether he would not condescend to discuss the issues that were involved in the debate between myself and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

When the gentleman from Washington reads what I said on the point that he discussed—and I shall not change it in a single particular—I do not believe that the gentleman himself in his own conscience, if he has one left, will conclude that he was justified in saying what he did. I stated that a written statement prepared by a man whose name I gave, as far as Washington was concerned, had been submitted to another man, whose name I also gave, and that I had submitted the statement to another man of national reputation, whose name I did not give; but I will say to the House that I expect to be able to give it within the next few days, and every man here will admit, when he hears it, that I told absolutely the truth about it, and never exaggerated it for a moment. The gentleman

from Washington will have to admit it. I stated then that I did not expect that to add to the effect of the statement as evidence, but that it went a good way to convince me of the truth of the statement written by the man whose name I gave and in whom I had confidence.

I offered the evidence in the Washington case. I made it public and laid it bare, and the gentleman from Washington, after laboring half an hour here in personal abuse of myself, has failed to refer to a single particle of it. As far as he is concerned, this evidence pertaining to his own State stands here before the House and before the country absolutely uncontradicted. He can not gain anything by abusing the man who brought it out, and I am not going to take the time of this House or of anybody else to try to reply to a man who resorts to such disreputable, uncourteous, and disrespectful methods. He can not gain anything—

Mr. MANN. Unless the gentleman withdraws that language, I shall ask to have it taken down.

Mr. NORRIS. Let it be taken down.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the language taken down—characterizing language used by any gentleman on the floor of the House as disreputable.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to taking it down. I suppose it has already been taken down. The gentleman from Illinois has misquoted me. I have not used the language that the gentleman from Illinois has imputed to me.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman did use the word "disreputable" in connection with the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not say that the gentleman from Washington was disreputable.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the language be read.

Mr. NORRIS. If I have said anything that is wrong, no man on earth will more quickly apologize for it than I will. I remember what I said, I think, and if my recollection is right, there is not anything in the language that is wrong or that is not justified under the circumstances.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I did not think that the gentleman would want the language to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the time taken by the gentleman from Illinois should not be taken out of my time. He has raised a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska had already expired.

Mr. NORRIS. But the gentleman from Illinois has raised a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman had expired in any event.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of controversy may not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been taken out of the gentleman's time. The time had expired in any event. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have control of the time, and I will be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. NORRIS. I am about through.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time does the gentleman from Nebraska wish?

Mr. NORRIS. About two minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I was about to conclude by saying that in the statement of the Washington case I showed what had been done in Washington by Coiner, the chairman of the State central committee. I showed how he had been rewarded, or, at least, since doing that and since the Chicago convention has received an appointment as United States district attorney. When they are out of evidence and have nothing left but personal abuse of the man who brings the evidence out, and does it reluctantly, as I said yesterday, then they select the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to make a speech abusing me for 26 minutes, without referring to the evidence at all; and I presume, like the other man from Washington, Coiner, he will receive his reward the same as the other fellow did. I would not be surprised if before long we will find that the man in the White House has rewarded the man here who had devoted his time to the personal abuse of the man who developed the facts and brought them out before the House and the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, at some future time I may desire to spend a little more time in reply to some of the observations of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RODENBERG. Just now I wish just briefly to make a few comments. The gentleman attempts to appeal to every class of prejudice that might possibly exist in the bosom of any living human being in the United States. He sings the praises of Thomas Jefferson. A eulogy upon Jefferson by the gentleman from Illinois, who has spent his whole lifetime in fighting every vital principle advocated by Jefferson, seems to me to be superb humbug. He criticizes Mr. Wilson because Mr. Wilson in his writing has said that Jefferson was an aristocrat. Mr. Wilson did say that, and it is not the first time I have heard it said. It has been my understanding all of my life that Thomas Jefferson was personally an aristocrat; that he was proud, even haughty; that he himself was responsible for a change in the order of the sitting of the Cabinet in this country, around the council board of the head of the Nation, because he did not propose to take a lower seat than Mr. Hamilton, and therefore the Secretary of State in this country is seated at the Cabinet meetings on the right hand of the President, whereas in England the chancellor of the exchequer, corresponding to our Secretary of the Treasury, has that high position in the cabinet. Mr. Jefferson was an aristocrat and Washington was an aristocrat; so was Lafayette, one of the noblest defenders that came from foreign climes to help us wrest our independence from the old mother, Great Britain. Aristocrat many times have devoted their lives to the service of the whole human race, and the history of the labor legislation in Great Britain is the story of the joint labor of a nobleman and a son of labor. Lord Ashley, I believe it was, on the one hand and John Burns on the other labored hand in hand to redeem the toiling masses of England and to give place on the statute books of England to the most progressive labor legislation that the world up to now has ever seen.

It is not a remarkable thing that the gentleman should now undertake to criticize Mr. Wilson by reading extracts from his book. This thing of reading extracts is a wonderful way of misrepresenting the character of individuals and also their views. I have heard Thomas Jefferson quoted as being in favor of ship subsidies and discriminating tonnage dues, and yet, when you read the passages which are quoted and the context unquoted, it simply shows that Mr. Jefferson said in his writings that as long as England adopted measures oppressing our merchant marine we, in retaliation, should adopt discriminating duties, and that he was in favor of free seas, but it also shows that if he could he would remove all restrictions. Such illustrations of the garbled and isolated extracts from writings will be found in many, many political speeches, and only the full context can sometimes bring a right conception of the views of the writer, whose disconnected expressions are used to distort his views. As to Mr. Wilson's views and relations to labor, while the gentleman comments on the fact that Mr. Wilson has been charging that Mr. Gompers and his companions are seeking to tear down industry in this country and to destroy the industrial supremacy of the country, it is a strange thing that Samuel Gompers himself is for Woodrow Wilson for President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Samuel Gompers has watched the works of the man and is with him. Mr. RODENBERG can eulogize Thomas Jefferson, yet all of his life he votes the other way, and he criticizes Woodrow Wilson, who all of his life has voted to support and maintain the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois sings the praises of CHAMP CLARK to-day, and yet his party associates, if not himself, were busy collecting little extracts from the sayings of CHAMP CLARK in order that had he been nominated at Baltimore he also might be torn to shreds by spreading before the country just pieces of what he had said. I wonder if the praise of Mr. CLARK by Republicans to-day is not just with the faint hope of hurting Wilson rather than helping CLARK. I simply wish to say that in this coming race we will meet the gentlemen with their criticisms fair or unfair. Not only will we show that Samuel Gompers is for him, but that in the State of New Jersey, where for over one year he has administered the affairs of that Commonwealth, all the labor unions are unanimously for him, as they are all over the country where they know his work; and when this campaign is over by his fruits he shall be known, and the fruits of labor of Mr. Wilson as a public man the people of this country will approve, and they will elect him President of these United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].



Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the House to print in the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. P. C. Wadsworth, of Georgia, delivered in Washington, D. C., July 19, 1912, at a meeting of Representatives in Congress from the cotton-growing States, upon the subject of the economical marketing of farm products.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the address referred to be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[For address, see elsewhere in to-day's RECORD.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, as an evidence of the very great amount of harmony that is existing in the Republican Party in Illinois, I desire to read a letter confirming that great degree of confidence which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] expressed in his party's success this fall:

TAFT'S MANAGERS CUT BY THEIR OWN KNIVES.

NEW YORK, July 15.

Oscar King Davis, at national headquarters of the new Progressive Party, has made public the following letter:

[E. R. Shuey, manager Villa Grove branch; L. A. Rider, manager Westfield branch, Shuey & Rider, dealers in general hardware, stoves, queensware, paints and oils, and groceries. Stores at Westfield, Ill.; Villa Grove, Ill.]

WESTFIELD, ILL., July 1, 1912.

DEAR SIRS: We have just received, via express prepaid, from you 1 dozen knives etched Taft and Sherman. We are at a loss to know just what to do with them. There is only one Taft man here, the postmaster, and he already has a jackknife. The majority of our people think Roosevelt is the nominee, and it would be justifiable homicide, or at least assault and battery against us, if we should offer the knives you sent us. Honestly, there are not three men in this town who are openly for Taft. Maybe we can sell them to the blind or those who can't read. We are receiving them under protest.

Respectfully,

SHUEY & RIDER.

"We want Teddy."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the above portrays the true situation of the harmonious conditions existing in the great State of Illinois in the Republican Party. What is true in that State is true in every other State, such a demoralized condition of affairs exists throughout the Union in the ranks of that party. Under such a condition, how can it hope to win? How can it expect victory? Defeat stares it in the face everywhere, and all the attacks it makes on Woodrow Wilson fall ineffectual upon the public's ear. Assault him or the Baltimore platform as they will or may, but nothing they can say or do will impede the march to victory of the Democratic Party and its standard bearers in this campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

International Seismological Association: For defraying the necessary expenses in fulfilling the obligations of the United States as a member of the International Seismological Association, including the annual contribution to the expenses of the association, for the fiscal year 1912, \$800.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this item, and I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill about these various items in this bill relating to international conferences. Last year on the consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill by the House these same items were in that bill, as reported to the House, if my memory serves me correctly. I think they went out on points of order made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. I know that they were not available for the last fiscal year. Now, do I understand it to be the policy of the Committee on Appropriations that in the consideration of one of the other appropriation bills coming from the committee which has jurisdiction of that appropriation bill, where items are not inserted in the appropriation law, thereupon the Committee on Appropriations includes those items in the deficiency appropriation bill? When things are deliberately stricken out, when appropriation bills come from another committee and items do not go into the law, does the Committee on Appropriations sit as a board of review and provide in the deficiency bills items which were estimated for but refused in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there are three or four of these items. I regret—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will notice I did not touch the first item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I regret the gentleman from Illinois has reserved the point of order—

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman I will withdraw the point of order and I will ask the gentleman to explain the matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was about to say I regret the gentleman reserved the point of order on this particular item and did not reserve it on the first item.

Mr. MANN. I think the first item ought to be allowed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The International Prison Commission, in which the gentleman himself is so vitally interested, is an item as to which he might have directed these remarks in apparent criticism of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In that event, if the House had felt that his criticism had been justified, he could have eliminated, on the point of order or by motion, not only the appropriation for the commission, just read, but the commission or congress, in which the gentleman is so much interested, and of which one of his most distinguished constituents is the representative of this Government. The committee's action was based upon these facts—

Mr. MANN. Before the gentleman proceeds, I did not make the point of order or reserve the point of order on the first item, because I was afraid somebody would make the point of order if I reserved it, and I did not want the item to go out on a point of order. I tried to put it on the diplomatic bill, and I did not succeed. I am in favor of that item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman tried to put it on the deficiency bill the last session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. I tried to put it on every bill I could.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And as a reward of the gentleman's persistency, in part, the committee considered the very persuasive argument made by him and decided to put it on this bill. The facts about these various commissions and associations are these. For a number of years under arrangements made by the Department of State, the United States has been a participant in the International Prison Commission, the International Railway Congress, the International Seismological Association. The cost in one instance is \$2,000, \$400 a year, and \$800 a year. For the last fiscal year, when the items were carried in the diplomatic bill the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] interposed points of order, and they were all stricken from the bill.

The items for the present fiscal year are carried in the diplomatic bill, which has already received the approval of the President. That leaves us in the anomalous position of having continued our connection with these associations or congresses for a number of years and of having refrained from paying our small subscription for one year. The committee thought that sooner than have the United States be put in the attitude for being indebted for \$400 in one instance and \$800 in another and \$2,000 for the expenses for the distinguished gentleman residing in the district of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Democratic Congress would remedy the dereliction of the Republican Congress and recommend to the House that these slight appropriations be made in order to discharge these obligations which a nation should discharge. We regret that a Republican Congress was unable to find itself able, because of its desire to reduce the appropriations, to appropriate this \$3,200; but rather than have the United States placed in that unfortunate position that the Nation could not afford to pay this \$3,200 for these various subscriptions, the committee recommended the appropriations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Touching the matter of the influence of committees, do these items have any stronger legal status in the appropriation bill than they would have had had they remained in the diplomatic and consular bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a few more minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These are conferences or arrangements into which the United States has entered through the Department of State. There is no authority for the department to do so. They have been doing it for a number of years, and Congress has acquiesced by making appropriations, but for one year no appropriation was made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My recollection is that is the reason given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], when he made the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Department of State had no authority to enter into these arrangements. It only could be done with the approval of Congress or the President and the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is on his feet I wish to ask him a question with reference to another matter. I do not notice any items in this bill for the payment of election-contest expenses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. None were certified to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentlemen who were interested that they had best get busy and have them certified.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee has no knowledge that there were any contests.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The practice of the committee has always been to insert in this bill the expenses of the contestants within the amount limited by law upon the certification of the chairman of the Committee on Elections. It has accepted his certificate. Either there have been no contests or those involved in them are reluctant to ask Congress to reimburse them.

Mr. MANN. I will say that the gentlemen who are interested had better get busy before this bill passes. Those items ought not to be inserted in the Senate, although they possibly could be. I know half a dozen or more gentlemen have spoken to me on both sides of the aisle, asking what the procedure was, and they have been told by me and others how to go at it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No gentleman has made any request, or I would have informed him of the practice to be followed—and I have enough gentlemen seeking my assistance to obtain appropriations without hunting them up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance after the payment of outstanding liabilities of the appropriation of \$170,000 for special repairs to the Subtreasury Building, New York, N. Y., contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 25, 1910, is reappropriated and made available toward construction of vaults and work incidental to their installation in the assay office in the city of New York, N. Y.; and said vaults and work incidental to their installation are authorized, at a total cost not exceeding \$322,000, including the sum herein reappropriated therefor, and a contract or contracts are authorized to be entered into within such limit of cost.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire also to reserve a point of order.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be heard on the point of order. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to inquire of the chairman if this language—

And said vaults and work incidental to their installation are authorized, at a total cost not exceeding \$322,000, including the sum herein reappropriated therefor, and a contract or contracts are authorized to be entered into within such limit of cost—  
is authorized?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The vaults will cost \$322,000, and making \$170,000 available at this time and giving authority to make a contract for the construction of them is all that is necessary now. The situation is that we have over one thousand million dollars in gold stored at present. We are accumulating gold at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year. Within five years all the possible available storage places in the United States will be filled. They have just completed in New York City a refinery for assaying gold, back of the old assay office, on Wall Street. The condition of the vault there is such that it is imperative that a new one be constructed. A vault one story high would cost \$168,000. By going any farther down it is necessary to go down sufficiently far to get a rock foundation, and to do that would require but very little more to complete a five-story vault. Four stories of it will be below the water line in the city of New York, which makes a very effectual protection. These vaults when completed will hold over two thousand millions of gold and will furnish all of the storage space for gold for an indefinite period. If the work is to be done, it must be done at this time in connection with the work that is going on at present. In the last Congress \$170,000 was appropriated to rearrange and refit the Subtreasury in New York, which is adjacent to the assay office. Upon investigation the Treasury Department states that the advantages to be gained from the expenditure of this money will be so insignificant that it would not be an advisable expenditure, but the necessity for the vaults is very great and very pressing. They ask that that money be made available for the vaults. They presented plans and information which led the committee to believe that if the vaults are to be built at all the most economical and most advisable plan to adopt is the one which gives the five-story vault for the \$322,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This \$170,000 was not sufficient to build these vaults?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not appropriated for that purpose. It was not available. It was for improvements to the subtreasury. A one-story vault could be built for \$168,000, but the very greatly increased storage space that could be obtained by less than double that sum, together with the very greatly increased protection that would come from the sinking of these vaults below the water line induced the committee to adopt this plan.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from New York I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I renew the point of order and reserve it. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] a question. It may be the information has been given, for so long as the gentleman, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, insists on remaining in the middle of one side of the House it is impossible on the other side of the House to hear what he says. Is not this item an item over which the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has jurisdiction?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not. It belongs to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. Why?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is an item intimately connected with the security of funds under control of the Treasury Department, and such items have always been carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MANN. If a bill were introduced for this purpose, it would go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no information about that.

Mr. MANN. Nobody in the House has more information than has the gentleman as to how bills should be referred.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no information about the matter except that which was submitted by the Treasury Department, and the committee believed it was a desirable thing to do.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, these vaults if completed under the plan proposed will be capable of storing \$2,000,000,000 of gold?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two thousand millions.

Mr. MANN. That is two billions. I understand that is a part of the program of the Committee on Appropriations, to store the gold in the assay office in New York and to abolish the assay offices in other parts of the country—a proposition which came into the House on the sundry civil bill in naked form and was temporarily defeated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance that this has nothing to do with that, but I think it is a part of that plan to do away with the assay offices on the Pacific coast and at Denver and St. Louis and in North Carolina and at various other places and concentrate them all in New York City, where there is ample room to store all the gold in the new vaults that we have just provided for. However, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, by inserting at the end of line 22 the following: "For rent and expenses incident thereto of the building leased for use as a customhouse in the port of Boston for the year ending June 30, 1913, \$96,000."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, in the act approved March 4, 1909, an appropriation was made for the remodeling of the Boston customhouse, including the expenses of carrying on that service while the remodeling was under way. There was a proviso in that act as follows:

That the total cost of said enlargement, remodeling, or extension of said customhouse building shall not exceed \$1,800,000, including expenses incident to the temporary removal of the force employed in the customhouse during the enlargement, remodeling, or extension.

Last month an act was passed practically increasing the appropriation for this purpose. The amount of money that was to be expended for rent and other things incident thereto aggregated \$285,000. It was virtually the striking out of this part of the act which I have just read, that no part of the amount, \$1,800,000, should be used for the expenses incident to the temporary removal of the force employed in the customhouse during the remodeling of the building.

Now, there is enough money available to continue the construction of this building until the 4th of next March, so that it is not necessary in this bill to appropriate any more money for that purpose. But there is no authorization for paying rent in the quarters that are now being occupied by the customhouse, and I am informed by the Treasury officials, and particularly by the Comptroller of the Treasury Department, that there is great doubt whether they have any right to expend any money which would otherwise have been available if this act which I have just read had not been passed—to expend any money for rent or other matters that would be incidental to the rental of these quarters. This amount of money will have to be appropriated, either now or later, for this rental, and it seems to me that it is wise and proper that the item should go in this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this item is not in this bill because it is not necessary. We appropriated for the matters of construction and rent in the sundry civil bill to the amount of \$500,000. I am not certain of the exact sum, but it is all that can be used. The law that was enacted does not in



any way change the availability of that appropriation. The purpose of it was to increase the limit of the amount that might be expended on the building proper. There is no necessity of putting this item of \$96,000 on this bill. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word more; I would like to say that the Comptroller of the Treasury Department is in disagreement with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on that point. He is in doubt, and he would so say to anybody who would communicate with him—that there is strong doubt as to that authorization.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I may say to the gentleman that the comptroller and myself frequently disagree, and the inclusion of this item in the bill would result in the comptroller resolving the doubt in his own way.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to find out how many gentlemen agree with the comptroller against the opinion of the chairman of the committee, and therefore I ask for a vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no disposition to withhold the money authorized by law for the customhouse. The committee gave all that could be expended, not only for the building but also for rent. It is absolutely futile and unnecessary to add \$96,000 to this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it not going to be necessary to appropriate at some time this \$96,000 for this year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On that theory we might as well appropriate at this time, instead of \$500,000 to complete that building, the entire balance under the limit authorized by law. The gentleman might as well say it is necessary to appropriate now for the gentleman's salary for the next 10 years. I hope the gentleman will continue his service here for that long, but that is no reason why it should be done this year.

Mr. WEEKS. But, Mr. Chairman, if this money is to be appropriated some time, it should have been appropriated in the sundry civil bill for the year ending June 30, 1913, and inasmuch as it was not appropriated in that bill, it seems to me it should be carried now in this bill. Otherwise we are going on and spending money for rental during the year when there is no actual authorization.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is an appropriation for it carried in the sundry civil bill, that covers this item for rental.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in what bill it is planned to make the authorization? I understand from the position of the chairman that it is not necessary to appropriate this \$96,000 now, because it will be taken care of at some other time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because it was included in the \$500,000 carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a matter of dispute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not understand that it is a matter of dispute.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course it is a matter of dispute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not call these matters of dispute.

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand, there is a lump sum of \$500,000 appropriated in the sundry civil bill, and this \$96,000 may or may not be included in the \$500,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no question of may or may not. It is included.

Mr. MURRAY. There is no question in the mind of the gentleman, but in the minds of some other gentlemen there is a question. Is that not so?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I never heard of it until a few days ago.

Mr. MURRAY. Has the comptroller, for instance, expressed an opinion on it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I never heard from the comptroller about it. The committee gave all the money asked toward the construction and rent of the Boston customhouse in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Has the gentleman ever heard until to-day that the comptroller takes a different attitude?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I never heard that the comptroller did so. If the appropriation were needed, I would not object to it. In my opinion, it is not necessary and should not be made.

Mr. MURRAY. And the House may have the assurance of the gentleman that it has already been appropriated in the sundry civil bill for these purposes? Is that the fact?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The sundry civil bill carries, if I recall correctly, \$500,000 toward the construction of the Boston customhouse, and out of that \$500,000 it was contemplated and expected and intended to pay the proportion of the \$96,000 rent that would be required until the next sundry civil bill becomes a law in March next.

Mr. WEEKS. Will my colleague yield while I ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. I find in the sundry civil bill this item:

Boston (Mass.) customhouse: For continuation of the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of the building under present limit, \$250,000.

It says nothing about rent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not necessary to say anything about rent. That was covered by the original act.

Mr. WEEKS. Will not the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] agree that this \$96,000 must be appropriated some time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not. I insist that it has been appropriated and that it is included in the item in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Is that the item which the gentleman from Massachusetts has just read?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; that is the item. There was a similar item, out of which they paid the rent last year, and this is the item out of which they will pay the rent this year.

Mr. MURRAY. The item is \$250,000 instead of \$500,000. I wonder if it is the same item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was under the impression that it was \$500,000. It is the same item, however.

Mr. MURRAY. I see that says nothing about rent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it says nothing about architects' fees, either.

Mr. MANN. The original act provided that the limit of cost should be so much, and out of that should be paid the cost of moving the customhouse. That was considered to include rent. I heard a gentleman the other day wax eloquent upon that. We passed a bill here the other day providing for the reimbursement to this fund of any money that was paid as rent, but these items, so far, have all been like that in the appropriation bill and rent has been paid out of them. It seems to me it is not a question whether \$96,000 rent can be paid out of the \$250,000 as a matter of law, but whether the \$250,000 toward the continuation of the improvement over there is sufficient for the next year with the \$96,000 taken out. Whether it was contemplated by the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman might just as well have added to his amendment an item proposing to reimburse the appropriation heretofore made by \$280,000, as requested by the department.

Mr. WEEKS. The reason I did not add that to my amendment was because I was informed by the department that they had sufficient money for construction purposes until the 31st of next March, and therefore it would not be necessary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They assured us that the money we appropriated would be sufficient for construction purposes until the 4th of next March, as well as to pay the rent. Perhaps we have given them more than we should have in the item, if the gentleman's statement be correct, but the fact is that the only thing done by the act passed by Congress was to make it possible to spend for construction \$300,000 more than originally had been intended. There is no necessity to appropriate the additional \$96,000 at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The accounting officers of the Treasury Department are authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of W. S. Richards, disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, \$93.50, and S. R. Jacobs, disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, \$101.16, being amounts disallowed by the said accounting officers for sums paid by the said disbursing clerks prior to April 18, 1911, for wrapping and addressing Public Health Reports and other circulars and publications of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire whether, after the comptroller held that the Public Health and Marine Hospital Service could not pay for the work of mailing Public Health Reports out of the general appropriation, that was corrected in making the general appropriation for this year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not. These persons were employed in violation of the act of 1882 prohibiting the payment for personal services at the seat of government out of certain appropriations unless specifically authorized. These men had done the work and the committee thought they should be paid.

Mr. MANN. It was not because the original appropriation did not authorize the work to be done, then, but only because of the method of their employment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is very doubtful whether they had any authority to incur the obligation for this service at all.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, they had authority to wrap, address, and mail Public Health Reports, but they could not pay for personal services out of that appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

To defray the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs, being additional to the permanent appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, \$350,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York inform the House if any of this money is for the purpose of investigation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to meet the pay roll for the latter half of the month of June. It has been customary for Congress in the past to appropriate a sum of money somewhat insufficient to meet the expense of the customs service. Early in the month of June the Treasury Department called attention to that fact and stated that unless the money was to be appropriated it would be necessary to furlough a very large number of employees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has nothing to do with investigations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee took up the matter with the department, and upon investigation informed the department it would recommend an appropriation of \$350,000 to cover the deficiency that would be created. Upon that assurance the department continued these employees, and the amount actually required is within a few hundred dollars of the \$350,000, and that is merely to meet the deficiency for the last fiscal year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They are regular employees?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not engaged in any special or secret-service work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The matter to which the gentleman refers, some special investigation, I think, was predicted within a few days by the press.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And would not come from this appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This item has nothing to do with that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motor tags: For additional amount required for the purchase of enamel, metal, or leather identification-number tags for motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1912, \$200.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Inasmuch as these tags when purchased are paid for on the half-and-half system and are sold by the District of Columbia at \$2 each, and then afterwards the United States has to put \$2 each against that to offset it as a source of revenue for the District of Columbia, does the gentleman not think the District of Columbia should pay for the whole of it? There is a provision later along in the bill providing this and all other items relating to the District of Columbia shall be paid for one-half by the District of Columbia and one-half by the United States. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, that the District of Columbia shall pay this entire sum out of this revenue.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is to supply deficiencies in these items. This is a small sum. I believe on the District bill which has been enacted into law there is a provision which covers this matter. It covers in the future just what the gentleman wishes to do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kentucky will permit, I raised this question a number of years ago, and it was covered as to certain things; and in the last District appropriation bill, which just became a law, there was inserted in the Senate and, I think, agreed to in such form that it would cover this and all similar cases a provision that the money received from the sale of these should be covered into the Treasury on the half-and-half principle. So that the appropriation is payable on the half-and-half principle, one-half from the Government Treasury and one-half from the District treasury, and as the money that comes in equals what is paid out the money that comes in goes into the Treasury, one-half to the credit of the General Treasury and one-half to the credit of the District treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am thoroughly familiar with that, and there are several items preceding this and some which follow that are small and trifling. Yet it is the principle of the thing. There is a provision following providing that the United States Government shall pay half of this and the District of Columbia shall pay half. When the United States Government pays half of this

\$200 it thereby paves the way to let that \$200 and all that the tags are sold for find its way into the treasury of the District of Columbia as a source of revenue, and then next year the United States Government will have to put up an amount to equal this.

Mr. MANN. If the United States Treasury pays one-half of the \$200 and then the tags are sold for \$200—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They are sold for a good deal more than that. They may be sold for several thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. Half of that goes into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Not of this item.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; of the next item.

Mr. MANN. Oh, all of these items.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Not of this.

Mr. MANN. I want to say that my understanding is to the contrary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My understanding of it is—and I think I am right—that the tags purchased with the amount in the appropriation bill which has recently passed comes under the description referred to by the gentleman from Illinois, but not under this.

Mr. MANN. There was general language inserted by the Senate and agreed to in conference which was intended to cover all of these items wherein the Government contributed half, that the receipts should go one-half to the Government. Whether that language is sufficient I do not undertake to say. I think it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My recollection is that it is not sufficient, but it is a trifling thing here—only \$200—and, as it is, and as I have overlooked several other small items, I will ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the amendment which I offered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is to pay an outstanding obligation. The tags have been bought. It is possible they have all been sold and the proceeds turned into the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Turned into the District treasury; and that is the objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Horse-drawn vehicle tags.—For additional amount required for the purchase of metal identification-number tags for horse-drawn vehicles used for business purposes in the District of Columbia—

For the fiscal year 1912, \$550.

For the fiscal year 1911, \$500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order for the purpose of at least asking the chairman of the committee what disposition will be made of the sale of those tags?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Is it not true they have already been covered into the District treasury?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no information on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think I can safely say that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I believe, the District having sold these tags and having gotten the money and put it into their own treasury, and the Government having to pay dollar for dollar, unless an amendment be agreed to letting the District pay this, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to discuss the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman before he discusses the point of order that in the report made here they admit the point of order and state in the report that it is "submitted matter."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody can concede a point of order who does not belong to this House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman can find no authority; if he has it, he must do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I understand correctly, the law authorizes the commissioners to require identification tags. There is a regulation which requires all horse-drawn vehicles to be provided with these tags. Under authority given the commissioners they make these regulations and they furnish these tags at a fixed price.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is no act of Congress authorizing it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, the act of Congress specifically specifies that there shall be these vehicle tags and that they shall be furnished by the District of Columbia upon



application, and so much shall be paid for them. We had that act up the other day for amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the statute authorizes the commissioners to make regulations, compels them to furnish the tags, and it is an instance in which, the law requiring them to do the act, there is authorization to incur a deficiency. Now, the appropriation last year was \$500. The receipts up to the time the estimates were submitted were \$3,658.

The proceeds from this tax went into the District treasury, and the purpose now would be a change of that law. The only question, I understand here, is as to the authority of the commissioners to purchase these tags. If there is any question about it I will be glad to have the matter passed until later we can find the statute which authorizes them to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order that the purchase has not been authorized, and I will say in the report submitted by the commissioners themselves, which is Document No. 634, they say that in the fiscal year 1912, "submitted," \$550; for the fiscal year 1911, they quote the act of March 4, 1911, volume 36, page 1296, section 1, \$500, but that is only an appropriation without formal authorization and they claim no authorization for the \$550. I have the report in my hand, document No. 634.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman simply refers to a document in which the estimate is simply submitted, and there is no information there. I would like the matter be passed temporarily until we can find the statute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I might be out for a moment and the gentleman will permit me to be present when it comes up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman only steps out temporarily, but we want to get along with this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be passed temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I insist that under the law the authority exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I insist, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must produce his authority; that is the rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Chair may have that information without the gentleman producing it, but certainly I do not think that the gentleman would object to passing the matter temporarily. If the Chair is not satisfied that the statute exists I will ask the Chair himself to reserve his decision temporarily, as he has the power to do, and let us pass on until an opportunity is given for the Chair to be satisfied as to what the law is.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by providing that the two amounts shall be paid entirely out of the District revenues.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would the gentleman from Kentucky have his amendment inserted, at the end of the section? Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 4, page 8, insert "Provided, That half of this amount indicated in these figures be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman will not seriously contend—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I make the point of order. Under the law one half of the expenses of the District of Columbia is payable from the District treasury and one half from the Federal Treasury. My recollection is that there are several rulings made, particularly upon the item for playgrounds, in which it was held that an attempt to make the entire cost of the playgrounds payable out of the District revenues was subject to the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, nobody who pretends to be familiar with the act of June 11, 1878, will contend that the United States Government has ever agreed to pay half the expenses of the District of Columbia. The furthest that act goes is, and nobody familiar with it will claim that it goes beyond, paying one-half of such expenses of the District of Columbia as Congress may agree to pay. Congress has not agreed to pay this, and Congress will not have agreed to pay it until at this session it adopts the motion agreeing to pay this. I contend that Congress has never agreed to pay this—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask to have the amendment again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, after line 4, insert the following: "That half of this amount indicated in this paragraph be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I did not say half; I said the total amount of the two sums be paid out of the District revenues. There is a provision a little later along that says of all these items one-half shall be paid by the District of Columbia and one-half by the Federal Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, after line 4, insert "that the total of the two amounts indicated in this paragraph be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist that it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is subject to a point of order. The provision for it to be paid out of the Federal Treasury makes it subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. Let us vote on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 18.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Industrial Home School for Colored Children: For maintenance, including purchase and care of horses, wagons, and harness.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on agricultural credit banks, appearing in the June issue of the Journal of the Institute of Bankers, of London. It is not very long, about 25 pages, and it is a very valuable contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as a part of his remarks a certain publication which he has named.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman prefer to have it printed in the RECORD or as a House document?

Mr. HOBSON. To have it printed as a House document will be satisfactory.

Mr. SHERLEY. You can do that when you get in the House.

Mr. HOBSON. All right. I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Special assessment refunds: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to pay to Carrie Madison the sum of \$146.47, amount paid by her on account of redemption of erroneous sale of special assessment taxes chargeable to property owned by her.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the item. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not true that Carrie Madison has paid to the District of Columbia \$146.47 as taxes erroneously collected, and that now the District of Columbia proposes by this bill to return her money to her, and under the provisions of this bill, in returning her money which the District of Columbia got, the United States Government is asked to pay one-half of it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think not. I think this is assessment work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It says:

Erroneous sale of special assessment taxes chargeable to property owned by her—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Tweedale, the auditor of the District, makes the following statement:

In this case Congress provided the special assessment should go back, half to the United States and half to the District of Columbia. Previous to that they have been going back to the appropriation. When they went back to the appropriation, if a person made an erroneous payment, we could pay them out of the appropriation. Now the money is put back half in the United States funds and half in the District funds, and there is no way we can refund erroneous payments.

This money having been placed half to the credit of the United States and half to the credit of the District of Columbia, when it is to be repaid—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I beg your pardon; it was paid entirely by the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman may be better informed than the auditor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not think the auditor says that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am reading from the statement of the auditor that this money went half to the United States and half to the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Read it and see if you are not mistaken.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It says:

In the case just preceding and in this case Congress provided the special assessment should go back, half to the United States and half to the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Now, read on.

Mr. FITZGERALD (reading)—

Previous to that they have been going back to the appropriation, and if a person made an erroneous payment we could pay them out of the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They paid them out of the appropriation, and the appropriation was upon the half-and-half plan.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But that is the general appropriation, and this money has been erroneously paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Into the District treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I assert again that the auditor states it has been paid half to the District treasury and half to the Treasury of the United States, and this proposes to repay it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] will permit, a few years ago, upon the consideration of the District appropriation bill, I called the attention of the House to the fact that at that time we were appropriating half out of the general revenues for the maintenance of the office which did this work, and issued permits, and collected special assessments; that all the revenues that came in went entirely into the District treasury. The gentleman in charge of the bill at that time, or subsequently, provided by amendment or by a new bill—it was in different cases—that this money should go half into the Federal Treasury and half into the District of Columbia treasury. I presume by the auditor's statement that this case was covered by that. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Can the gentleman from Illinois say with any degree of accuracy what is to become of the deficit of \$73,000 in that same fund, which was stolen a few years ago?

Mr. MANN. I can not say with any degree of accuracy with reference to that or this item further than I have said. But I will say further, I find upon examination of the recent District bill, which contains section 10, providing for the covering in on the half-and-half principle of receipts, it would not cover this case apparently and would not cover the motor tags or vehicle tags.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This particular matter was taken care of last year.

Mr. MANN. Several years ago, I think. The new provision covers the annual wheel tax on automobiles and other motor vehicles, but I do not think covers the tag proposition which I stated a while ago I thought it did cover.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will withdraw the point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Judgments: For payment of the judgments, including costs, against the District of Columbia, set forth in House Documents Nos. 402, 634, 648, and 777 of this session, \$8,944.04, together with a further sum sufficient to pay the interest, at not exceeding 4 per cent, on said judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the nature of these judgments. There is nothing here to show their nature. I have not seen the hearings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I did not look particularly to see what the judgments were for. They were final judgments of the court to which no appeal had been taken and from which none could be taken. It is customary for Congress to pay judgments of the courts after the time for appeal has expired.

To be frank with the gentleman, I did not bother to burden myself with the information regarding the nature of the litigation. I ascertained if the judgments were final and whether the time for appeal had expired; and that being shown and the claims being a valid obligation against the Government, I thought they should be paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then, the gentleman knows nothing about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nothing more than that. They are all small claims, I will state, except one for \$2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses, supreme court: For payment of such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and its officers, including the furnishing and collecting of evidence where the United States is or may be a party in interest, including also such expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, \$13,000.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill if there is in this paragraph or any other paragraph of the bill included any payment or any appropriation for the payment of services of the three prosecutors appointed by the court for the prosecution of the case of Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison in contempt proceedings?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This appropriation of \$13,000 is to meet certain expenditures, mostly all ascertainable—and \$12,000 of the amount is ascertained—in connection with the proceedings to acquire the property to be added to the Capitol Grounds. The attorney in charge of the proceedings appeared before the committee and made a statement as to the sum due. He said it was in the neighborhood of \$12,000, and he thought there would probably be an additional thousand dollars or so required to take care of small items. He stated that he had no definite information about them.

No request was made of the committee to pay for the services of the character mentioned by the gentleman, either on the part of the justice or anybody else.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. No such money is carried on this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No money is carried in this bill for that purpose, according to the understanding or intention of the committee. Whether any of these appropriations is available for the purpose I do not know. The attorneys in those proceedings were appointed by the court and acted as amici curiae—friends of the court—and I know of no authorization of law to pay for services of that character unless they are specifically authorized. I am not certain about it, but I know of none. No request was made, and no appropriation was made here with the intention of its being utilized for the purpose named by the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reimbursement of State of Texas: To reimburse the State of Texas the amount expended for the increased force of rangers required for policing and patrolling the international boundary along the Rio Grande during the months of October, November, and December of the year 1911, and during the month of January of the year 1912, \$9,639.41.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to ask if there is any authority of law for this item? That is, the Texas item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; there is no authority for it.

Mr. MANN. Was there any agreement that the Government should pay it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The President, I understand, made an arrangement with the governor of Texas, and sent a message to Congress in regard to it.

Mr. MANN. This is to carry out that agreement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; this is to carry out the arrangement.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay claims adjusted and settled under section 4 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved June 25, 1910, and certified to Congress in House Documents Nos. 313, 664, 713, and 823, at the present session, and 1386, Sixty-first Congress, third session, \$1,509.05.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I suppose this item refers to the payment of damages caused by collisions with Government vessels in river and harbor work. There is nothing in the item itself, without reference to the document to which it refers and the text of the law, to indicate what it is, but I think that is what it is. As I am the father of that scheme, I have some interest in it. Why is it not perfectly practicable to put the items in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have put in this bill only the claims certified in accordance with the law.

Mr. MANN. I am not questioning that, but why is it not practicable to put in briefly the items, so that we will know what they are?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would be pretty voluminous to do that in all these matters, and this is the customary way.

Mr. MANN. Oh, there has been no customary way. This is a new scheme.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. There are other certified claims besides these, and they are done in the same way, because in many instances they include a large number of very trifling claims. But the committee in preparing this bill included only those which were certified under the law. Where they were in excess of the amount limited to the department, the committee declined to insert them.

Mr. MANN. The reason why I asked the question is that I first presented this proposition to the House in connection



with the Lighthouse Board, and it went through, and the War Department copied it, and the river and harbor branch of the service and the Navy Department copied it, providing for the adjustment and settlement of claims not exceeding \$500 in any case, and I think I stated, when the first proposition came before the House as the result of that, that these claims would be certified to the Committee on Appropriations, and the items would thus come before the House, so that anybody who wished to know about them would know what they were; but I see I was mistaken.

The reason given by the gentleman is sufficient for me if there are a great many of these claims and they are individually very small.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the claims included in this particular document alone would probably take several pages of the bill. They are all small claims.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have these claims been adjudicated by the Court of Claims?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. Under the law certain claims for damages arising from collisions are investigated by certain departments, and if they do not exceed \$500 do not require to be adjudicated by the Court of Claims. If the department determines that the United States was at fault, the amount of the damages not to exceed \$500 is certified, and we make the appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Being interested in a matter of this kind, I want to learn the method of procedure. The total amount appropriated here is slightly in excess of \$1,500, but the persons to whom payment is to be made are not specified. There may be one or a number.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These claims are included in five different documents, and they are of this character:

J. Randazzo, for \$25, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to lugger *Australia* caused by collision with a United States Government barge on the night of December 15, 1910.

The Rathbun Co., for \$283.36, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to its wharf in Oswego (N. Y.) Harbor, caused by collision with the U. S. tug *W. H. Lee*, formerly the *Wm. C. Chapman*, on November 4, 1910.

F. H. & A. H. Chappell Co., for \$140.29, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to its dock, New London, Conn., caused by collision with the U. S. lighter *Panuco* on March 29, 1911.

Frygoe Jolstad, for \$18.75, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to his motor launch *Lyn* by U. S. snagboat *Missouri* at St. Charles, Mo., on July 5, 1911.

Krause & Banks, for \$25, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to their shipways at North Bend, Oreg., caused by collision with the U. S. dredge *Oregon* on June 6, 1911.

Columbia River Packers' Association, for \$100, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to its ship *Jabez Howes* and wharf at Astoria, Oreg., caused by collision with the U. S. dredge *Chinook* on February 4, 1911.

Johnson & Hamilton, for \$233.17, as reimbursement of cost of repairing damages to their launch *Taurus*, caused by collision with the U. S. dredge *Delatour* at Morgan City, La., on April 5, 1911.

W. G. Downie, for \$7.15, as reimbursement of cost of repairing his warehouse at Pomeroy, Ohio, damaged by collision with U. S. snagboat *E. A. Woodruff* on September 19, 1911.

This is one of five documents. The amount in each case is trivial.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, before the act was passed providing for the adjustment of these claims, and their settlement in this way, they came to the House in communications from the department and were referred to the Committee on Claims, or went to the Senate, where the same action was taken. It became the settled policy of both Houses, as frequently stated in the committee reports, for Congress in adjusting damages for collisions, where Government vessels were at fault, not to make an allowance for demurrage for the time that the vessel was laid up. That was the settled policy, as frequently stated by the committees, and time and again I have seen the matter voted upon in the House, and every time the House voted that it would not allow demurrage; that it would only allow the actual damage to the vessel. Yet these claims that are allowed here do cover demurrage. Not only that. Even the Committee on Claims is now undertaking to reverse the policy of the House; and the Senate has taken the back track on the question, and is willing to allow almost any amount of demurrage that anybody claims. It was for that reason that I called the attention of the committee to it, and will do so further if a certain bill now on the calendar gets before the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, my recollection from an examination I made of these documents was that there was no demurrage in any of these claims. I may be mistaken. My recollection is that they are all amounts fixed for repairs—unless the department includes under the term "repairs" an allowance for demurrage.

Mr. MANN. I have examined the claims, and there are allowances for demurrage; but, of course, the amount is small, and these claims are authorized and will have to be paid, I suppose.

The Clerk read as follows:

To reimburse the German ambassador at Washington, D. C., for expenses incurred by him in procuring information for the Interior Department as to the whereabouts in Germany of the heirs of John A. Beck, and Frank A. Armbruster, who died at the Government Hospital for the Insane, \$3.45.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, after line 17, add:

"Three hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to employ temporarily extra clerks by the Commissioner of Pensions to aid him in the work incident to the adjudication of pension claims filed under the act entitled 'An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico,' approved May 11, 1912, at salaries not to exceed \$1,200 each; and in order to facilitate said work the Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to employ clerks heretofore employed in other departments of the Government service, or others who may be sufficiently skilled to do the required work, without complying with the requirements of the civil-service laws: *Provided, however*, That none of said extra clerks shall continue in the service beyond the fiscal year of this appropriation without further legislation, or, by reason of said employment alone, be eligible for transfer to the service in other departments, or be continued longer than may be necessary to do the work hereby provided for."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order on the amendment, Mr. Chairman. This is a deficiency bill. There is no authority for the employment of these clerks.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order. These clerks are not needed.

Mr. MANN. The year which this bill covers is passed. They could not be employed in the future under this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the gentleman is in earnest when he says—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order. The gentleman can believe it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio is about to discuss the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. There is no question in my mind that the gentleman from New York is joking when he states that the Pension Bureau does not need additional help to adjudicate the claims—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not only not joking, but I know what I am talking about.

Mr. MANN. This bill only applies to the time before July 1, and if they needed them before the 1st of July, they could not employ them now under this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. The act was passed May 11, 1912, which was before the 1st of July.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that is covered in another bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a deficiency bill, and the gentleman wants to employ services during this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if an amendment was offered in the Senate to the sundry civil bill and the point was not made there, I can not understand why this amendment should not be adopted here. This House passed the most generous pension bill that was ever passed by any legislative body. It was based on service and disability. It was amended by the Senate and based on age, service, and disability. It passed the House, carrying an appropriation of \$75,000,000 approximately. The Senate amended it by cutting it down from a third to a half.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We will not discuss the pension matter at this time.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman desires to discuss the matter of pensions, I shall make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We do not care to enter into a competition between the gentleman from Ohio at this end of the Capitol and the gentleman from Ohio at the other end of the Capitol, who are competing for the favoritism of certain classes of persons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will proceed in order on the question of order.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from New York a question. This item under discussion here strikes me as being a peculiar one, and if the gentleman from New York can give the information as to the origin of it I should like to have it. It provides an appropriation of \$3.45 to pay the German ambassador for his services in locating the heirs of one John A. Beck and one Frank A. Armbruster.

Mr. MANN. For his expenses.

Mr. WILLIS. It strikes me as a peculiar item.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is a peculiar item.

Mr. WILLIS. Why was it desirable that the American Government should assume the obligation of hunting up the heirs of these two particular men? It arouses my curiosity.

Mr. MANN. It was not; but he did it.

Mr. WILLIS. Why should we do it?

Mr. MANN. Because the State Department requested him to do it; and in doing it he expended some money, and it is common courtesy that we should reimburse him the money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, John A. Beck, who had been a private in the Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, was sent to the Government Hospital for the Insane, where he died, leaving \$101.50 to his credit. According to the records taken at the time of his enlistment he was born in Germany. An effort was made to locate his heirs, in order to turn this money over to them. An effort was made through the German ambassador. The German ambassador incurred an expense of \$3.45, and presented a claim for reimbursement.

There was no appropriation out of which it might be made, and the committee believed that it was highly appropriate that Congress should authorize the payment of this sum of \$3.45 to reimburse the ambassador for the expense incurred by him in attempting to obtain for the Government of the United States the information desired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment and thank the gentleman for the information and desire to make the observation that it seems to me that it is a very complimentary reference to the care with which the business of this Government is conducted, particularly so far as the Appropriation Committee is concerned, that an item of \$3.45 can be figured out here to be paid a representative of a great government such as Germany.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was no appropriation from which it might be paid.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand, and I think it is perfectly proper.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was a claim, and while there might be some doubt as to the legality of the expense incurred at the request of the Government, the committee did not wish to raise any question of that character. The German ambassador having stated he spent the money doing this work, the committee felt that he should be reimbursed.

Mr. WILLIS. And I think it is right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And not compel him to bear the burden of the expenditures while obtaining information for this Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Charles F. Read, special disbursing agent, General Land Office, under the appropriation for "Expenses of hearings in land entries, fiscal year ended June 30, 1910," with the sum of \$8.39, being the amount disallowed by said accounting officers on account of payments in excess of 10 cents per folio made by the disbursing officer to United States commissioners in the State of Colorado for taking depositions in land hearings under section 4 of the act of January 31, 1903.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that after a long and arduous day's labor it is proper to rise. It seems that we might easily finish this bill by 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee has shown so much interest and we have made so much progress that I was in hopes that we might run a little longer.

Mr. MANN. I think we will be able to finish this in a very few hours to-morrow. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMMOND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 25970, the general deficiency appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

# INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS (H. DOC. NO. 890).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the information of Congress a report of the proceedings of the Eighth International Prison Congress, held at Washington in October, 1910, in pursuance of the invitation extended by the President in virtue of the joint resolution approved March 3, 1905.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State concerning the printing of the report of the proceedings of the prison congress.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1912.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the letter of the Secretary of State accompanying the President's message ought also to be read to the House, as there seems to be some question of doubt as to who ought to pay for the printing. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President a report of the proceedings of the Eighth International Prison Congress, held at Washington in October, 1910.

As this congress was so held by reason of the invitation extended by the President in virtue of the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, approved March 3, 1905, it would seem to be required that the report should be transmitted to Congress for the information of that body.

In recommending this action the undersigned feels obliged to say, however, that in view of the joint resolution approved March 30, 1906, entitled "Joint resolution to correct abuses in the public printing, and to provide for the allotment of certain documents and reports," the transmission of the report is not to be deemed to imply any request that it be printed if the cost of printing would be a charge against the Department of State, inasmuch as the appropriation for the printing of the Department of State is not sufficient to provide for the department's printing and also for the printing of documents of this description, as to which the department serves only as a conduit.

Respectfully submitted.

P. C. KNOX.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, July 25, 1912.

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily the order in this case would be that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed. There are 131 pages of typewritten matter of letter size constituting the papers in the case. The request of the Secretary of State, or his suggestion is, that he does not want to ask this to be printed, provided it is to be charged up to the printing fund of the office of the Secretary of State, because that seems to be about exhausted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I recall nothing whatever in the resolution providing for the invitation to be extended to this Congress that there should be any report made to the Congress of the United States. I do not see why the Secretary of State sends it here unless it is to have it printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. At the expense of Congress.

Mr. MANN. At the expense of Congress. It has not been usual, I think, for the Secretary of State to transmit to the House copies of the proceedings of all of the international congresses that are held here.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair will refer this message and the Secretary's letter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and order them printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the accompanying document lie on the table.

Mr. MANN. Why not print the document and charge it up to the State Department.

The SPEAKER. He does not want that done.

Mr. MANN. Then he has no business to send it here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the accompanying document lie on the table.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the matter remain on the Speaker's table for the present without reference until there can be investigation made.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, let us know the nature of the document.

The SPEAKER. It is a letter from the Secretary of State about the last meeting of the prison congress. Now, the Secretary of State in his letter which the President transmits with this bundle of papers, 131 pages of typewritten matter, makes the suggestion in this letter to the President that he does not recommend it to be printed for fear the printer's bill will be charged up to the office of the Secretary of State, and they are rather short in funds up there and did not want to assume that expense, and the Chair was trying to find out what to do with it.



Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, just a word in this connection. This Government is a member of the International Prison Commission, and every year we pay our pro rata share of the expense—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two thousand dollars.

Mr. SULZER. Yes; and, of course, it is very important, it seems to me, to the people of this country to have the reports of the commission printed, in order that they may know what is being done in prison reform. The taxpayers finally pay for the printing, and it is immaterial which department has it done. In order to get the information the report should be printed.

Mr. MANN. Is not the report of the proceedings of the International Prison Congress already printed by the International Prison Association?

Mr. SULZER. That I do not know.

Mr. MANN. I think it is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in the deficiency bill now under consideration we carry an item of \$2,000 as the subscription of the United States as an adhering member of the International Prison Commission for the expenses of the commissioner, including the preparation of the report. Having done that much, it is somewhat of a presumption for the Secretary of State to endeavor to have printed at the expense of the congressional allotment the proceedings of this prison congress. So far as I am concerned, if it can be avoided, it will not be done at the expense of the congressional allotment.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, it is immaterial to me who prints this document. If it is important, it ought to be printed for the benefit of the people of the country, and it will make no difference in the end to the taxpayers whether it is printed by the State Department or printed by the House of Representatives. If it is printed by the State Department, I suppose the State Department would have to send this document out to the various prison associations of the United States and to the various prison officials of the United States. If Congress prints it, then the Members of Congress will get the document, and they can send it out. I think its about as broad as it is long.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that, in effect, this is a request for a deficiency appropriation to help out the expense of this International Prison Congress?

Mr. SULZER. I do not know what the document contains. I want to find out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it is.

Mr. MANN. There was a large fund raised for paying the expenses of the congress—for printing the proceedings and for the actual expenses. If the proceedings have not been printed—I think they have, but I may be mistaken—then they are asking Congress to pay that expense, which was contemplated to be paid by the association.

Mr. SULZER. I will investigate the matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the accompanying document lie upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to lay this accompanying matter on the table, and the gentleman from Illinois suggests it remain on the Speaker's table.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in order to find out what it is and what to do about it, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We can examine it there.

Mr. HOBSON. May I ask the gentleman from New York what will be the status of the document if laid on the table?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will not be printed at the expense of the congressional allotment, if printed at all, until we know what is involved.

Mr. MANN. And it will be subject to the control of the House hereafter.

Mr. SULZER. That is so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If referred to the committee, it will be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion does not go to the message?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; only to the document.

The SPEAKER. The message and the letter of the Secretary of State will be printed and sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the accompanying papers lie on the table.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, until I can look into the matter I have no objection to that course being taken.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

#### RETURN OF BILL H. R. 18041.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 18041) grant-

ing a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street-railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii.

Attest:

CHAS. G. BENNETT,

Secretary.

By H. M. ROSE,

Assistant Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

CORNELIA BRAGG.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 25598) and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25598) an act granting a pension to Cornelia Bragg.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 22111. An act for the relief of the Delaware Transportation Co., owner of the American steamer *Dorothy*;

H. R. 20347. An act to authorize the Dixie Power Co. to construct a dam across White River at or near Cotter, Ark.;

H. R. 22043. An act to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 18033. An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 24598. An act for the relief of Jesus Silva, jr.;

H. R. 12375. An act authorizing Daniel W. Abbott to make homestead entry;

H. R. 13938. An act for the relief of Theodore Salus;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mary E. Quinn;

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries;

H. R. 24699. An act extending the time for the repayment of certain war-revenue taxes erroneously collected.

H. R. 20873. An act for the relief of J. M. H. Mellon, administrator, et al., all of Allegheny County, Pa.;

H. R. 11628. An act authorizing John T. McCrosson and associates to construct an irrigation ditch on the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii; and

H. R. 4012. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the State of Michigan.

#### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT BANKS (H. DOC. NO. 891).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have printed as a House document an article entitled "Agricultural credit banks," published in the Journal of the Institute of Bankers, London, in the month of June.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to have printed as a public document an article on agricultural credit banks, published in the Journal of the Institute of Bankers, London, in June. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, July 27, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bill and resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 6899) increasing the limit of cost for the erection and completion of a public building in the city of Richford, State of Vermont, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1009), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 505) directing the Sec-

retary of the Smithsonian Institution to send to the House of Representatives a complete list of the subscriptions, if any, made by private persons to the Smithsonian Institution or to any of its officers for the expenses in connection with the African hunting trip of ex-President Roosevelt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1071), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Isaac Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1068), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16604) for the relief of Lewis Montgomery, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1067), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1484) for the relief of Ferdinand Tobe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1070), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 25988) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 25989) to equip, build, complete, and furnish water, electric-light, and sewerage systems for the Fort Bidwell Indian School, on the Government reservation at Fort Bidwell, Cal., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 25990) to establish a mining experiment station at Helena, Lewis and Clark County, Mont., to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 25991) to amend section 3186 as amended by section 3 of the act of March 1, 1879; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 642) providing for consideration of the disposition of water rights on Schofield Military Reservation, Hawaiian Islands, in connection with the bill (H. R. 25970) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 25992) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Converse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 25993) granting a pension to Almira M. Meade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 25994) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25995) granting an increase of pension to Aries Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 25996) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 25997) for the relief of Joshua Algeo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25998) granting a pension to Andrew Crowl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 25999) for the relief of the heirs of Lindley Abel, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 26000) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Staples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 26001) granting a pension to Harry A. Rhea; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 26002) granting an honorable discharge to David D. Woods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 26003) granting an increase of pension to Moses McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 26004) granting an increase of pension to Annie Liese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of the State of New York, against passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of members of the Daughters of Liberty, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Fourteenth Street Store, New York City, against passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Papers to accompany bill in support of pension claim of George C. Brill, Troop M, Fourteenth Regiment United States Cavalry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 5461, to restrict the number of saloons in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of the State of Idaho, favoring passage of bill regulating express rates, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Idaho, against passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of merchants of Stites, Idaho, against passage of bills changing patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Ottawa (Ill.) Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill (S. 6850) and favoring a parcel-post commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of America, New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of citizens protesting against the passage of a general parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. SULZER: Petition of the committee of wholesale grocers, New York, favoring reduction of duties on all raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 27, 1912.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. BRANDEGEE and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 21480) to establish a standard barrel and standard grades for apples when packed in barrels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the continuation of coal-mining operations on certain lands in Wyoming.

The message further returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 18041) granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii.